







by Nikita Sergeevich

KHRUSHCHEV IN NEW YORK

A documentary record of Nikita S. Khrushchev's trip to New York, September 19th to October 13th, 1960, including all his speeches and proposals to the United Nations and major addresses and news conferences.

CROSSCURRENTS PRESS

NEW YORK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Foreword	5
Arrival in New York, September 19, 1960	7
Meeting with Fidel Castro, September 20	10
Disarmament, Colonialism, and Other International Problems. Statement in the General Debate at the Fifteenth Session of the United Nations General Assembly, September 23	11
Statement of the USSR Government on Disarmament, Submitted for Consideration of the United Nations General Assembly, September 23	58
Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament, September 23	72
Declaration on Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, September 23	81
An American Antique Dealer Presents Khrushchev with a Peace Pipe, September 23	95
News Conference at Glen Cove, September 24	97
News Conference at Glen Cove (II), September 25	103
Speech at Cyrus Eaton Luncheon, September 26	107
Letter to President of UN General Assembly, September 26 ...	115
Concerning Representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. Speech at the UN General Assembly, October 1	116
A Reply on the Question of the Structure of UN Governing Bodies. Speech at the UN General Assembly, October 3 ...	127
Reply to Letter and Draft Resolution Received from the Heads of Government of Ghana, India, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia, October 3	139

PUBLISHED BY CROSSCURRENTS PRESS, INC.

NEW YORK, 1960

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

A copy of this material has been filed with the Department of Justice where the registration statement of CROSSCURRENTS PRESS, INC., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N.Y., as a publishing representative of MEZHDUNARODNAYA KNIGA, Moscow, is available for inspection. Registration does not indicate approval or disapproval of this material by the United States Government.

Meeting with Members of United Nations Journalists Association, October 7	144
Television Interview with David Susskind, October 9	161
On the Procedure for Discussing the Disarmament Question. Speech at the UN General Assembly, October 11	185
Statement for Radio Cuba, October 11	190
Reply on Disarmament. Speech at the UN General Assembly, October 11	193
News Conference, October 11	200
The Question of Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Speech at the UN General Assembly, October 12	201
Remarks on the Colonial Question. Speech at the UN General Assembly, October 12	208
Reply on the Colonial Question. Speech at the UN General Assembly, October 12	209
Speech at Dinner for Delegations of New UN Members, October 12	214
Further Remarks on the Colonial Question. Speech at the UN General Assembly, October 13	218
The Threat to Universal Peace. Speech at the UN General Assembly, October 13	220
A Reply on the Question of Aggression. Speech at the UN General Assembly, October 13	224
Departure from New York, October 13	239
Speech on Return to Moscow, October 20	242

ILLUSTRATIONS: Khrushchev in meetings with the following: First page, top—Jawaharlal Nehru (India); bottom—Cyrus Eaton (second from right, USA). Second page, top (left to right)—Sukarno (Indonesia); Kwame Nkrumah (Ghana); bottom—Joseph Broz Tito (Yugoslavia); Gamal Abdel Nasser (UAR). Third page, top—Fidel Castro (Cuba); bottom—Sylvanus Olympio (Togo). Fourth page, top—Ali Omar Hagi Farah (Somalia); bottom—Mr. and Mrs. Watson Pierce (USA).

FOREWORD

Under the title *KHRUSHCHEV IN NEW YORK*, the publisher is making available all the important statements made by Nikita S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, during his stay in New York, September 19 to October 13, 1960, at which time he was Chairman of the Soviet delegation to the Fifteenth Session of the United Nations General Assembly. The following documents are included: a complete collection of his UN statements; all Soviet proposals to the UN during this period; other major addresses and news conferences in New York; a follow-up report delivered after Khrushchev's return to Moscow.

This collection comprises a full review of the present world situation as seen by the Government of the USSR. It is a vital part of an unprecedented chapter in diplomatic history, written by the largest gathering of world leaders ever to take place.

The release of this collection, of course, does not imply either acceptance or rejection of the ideas in it. It is published in the belief that we must be fully informed—fully informed about all aspects of developments that have such a direct bearing on our future and the fate of mankind.

THE PUBLISHER.

September 19, 1960

Arrival in New York

Nikita S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, and head of the Soviet delegation to the Fifteenth Session of the General Assembly, arrived in New York on September 19 on the turboelectric ship *Baltika*. With him were the following heads of delegations: N. V. Podgorny of the Ukrainian Republic; Kirill T. Mazurov of the Byelorussian Republic; Todor Zhivkov of Bulgaria; Janos Kadar of Hungary; and Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej of Roumania.

The *Baltika* arrived at Pier 73 on the East River, not far from the UN Building, at 9:17 A.M., New York time. Despite the heavy rain, many representatives of the diplomatic corps, newsmen and radio and television correspondents were gathered at the pier.

The welcoming party included Valerian A. Zorin, USSR Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs; Mikhail A. Menshikov, Soviet Ambassador to the United States; Antonin Novotny, President of Czechoslovakia and Wladyslaw Gomulka, head of the Polish delegation to the United Nations.

Also among those greeting the Chairman and his colleagues were Cyrus Eaton, American industrialist, and Mrs. Eaton.

After an exchange of greetings, Khrushchev made a brief statement to those assembled:

Statement at the Pier

This is my second visit to the United States of America. Last year I was here as a guest of your country's government. This time I have arrived in New York in a new capacity—as head of the Soviet delegation to the session of the UN General Assembly.

The thoughts and aspirations of a majority of people in all countries are now focused on one goal—how to achieve a situation in which lasting peace will be ensured all over the world. Naturally, people turn their eyes, first of all, to two countries—the United

States and the Soviet Union. They do this not because our countries are selected and marked by Providence, but because they are the strongest economically and are armed with mighty modern weapons.

Should the differences between us continue to grow and the statesmen of the two countries not try to stop the development of poor relations between our countries, everyone realizes what a threat that would be not only to the United States and the Soviet Union, but also to the whole world. We understand this and are trying to do everything to shape the development of relations in the direction of a peaceful adjustment of outstanding problems and the establishment of world peace.

One cannot give preference to feelings and emotions in politics. One should be guided here primarily by common sense and make a calm assessment of all the circumstances. Such is the lot of statesmen: they must see not only their close friends, but also have to go where the interests of their people tell them to go; they do it for the common cause of all nations—for the cause of consolidating world peace.

The Soviet Union attaches very great importance to the question of establishing lasting peace. In order to ensure such peace it is necessary that all countries, and primarily the United States and its allies, realize the need for agreeing on disarmament under strict international control.

Lasting peace on earth will be established only when armaments are scrapped. But if these armaments are loaded and are in a holster on your belt, then neither one side nor the other will feel sure that a conflict will not accidentally break out somewhere.

That is why the Government of the Soviet Union has asked the United Nations to submit for consideration by the General Assembly the supreme question of contemporary international relations—the problem of general and complete disarmament under corresponding strict international control.

The Soviet Government is gratified to note that a number of countries have taken a very serious approach to this problem, and that leading statesmen are heading the delegations of their countries to the UN General Assembly.

Unfortunately, certain statesmen merely speak in defense of the United Nations and call for the consolidation of its prestige,

but in reality they are against having the disarmament problem discussed effectively at the UN General Assembly. What is this but a disparagement of the role of the international organization called upon to ensure peace among the nations?

That is why, frankly speaking, I felt very strange when I read recently the statement of Secretary of State Herter alleging that Khrushchev was coming to America for propaganda purposes, and that the Soviet proposal on the participation of the leading statesmen in the discussion of the disarmament problem at the General Assembly is "absolutely absurd." What a strange sort of logic!

Disarmament is the biggest problem which has for many years now baffled the representatives of different countries who have been vainly discussing it in various committees at different levels. And now when the Soviet Government submits a proposal to have the leading statesmen participate in the discussion of this question at the General Assembly so as finally to break the deadlock on this issue and find a solution for it, its proposal is called propaganda. Yes, this indeed is a strange sort of logic! Those who are working for the solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament fail to understand such logic. If certain statesmen declare that Khrushchev has come to the General Assembly to engage in propaganda, there is nothing left for me but to be proud of such a propaganda mission in favor of peace; and without sparing any effort, I shall engage in such propaganda until even the thick-skulled are convinced of the need for reaching agreement on general disarmament and thereby ensuring peace throughout the world.

I do not know whether I understood correctly the recent decision of the American Government on the participation of the US President, Mr. Eisenhower, in the work of the General Assembly. Perhaps the United States has now revised its attitude toward the Assembly sessions and has also come to the conclusion that the UN can seriously carry on negotiations for reaching a disarmament agreement. Well, if it is not merely a fancy speech they mean but really constructive participation in the Assembly's work, we hail such a decision.

In conclusion I would like to express my great respect for the American nation and wish it success. I have the best feeling from my last year's visit to the United States and my meetings with the

American people. I still remember the good impressions I received from the talks with public figures, statesmen, representatives of American business circles and with plain Americans—workers, farmers and intellectuals.

I'm sure that the relations between our great countries will improve. It is common knowledge that no matter how dark a night might be, it is invariably followed by dawn. That is why I'm sure that no matter how hard the evil forces try to make the atmosphere tense in the relations between our countries, they will certainly fail.

Good times will come when there will be warm and friendly relations between our nations and our governments. It is in pursuance of this aim, which will help to improve the relations among all the countries of the world, that the Soviet Union is prepared to continue to work insistently, honestly and purposefully. It is in the name of the consolidation of the cause of peace and solution of complicated international problems that the Soviet delegation has come to the Fifteenth Session of the UN General Assembly in New York. Thank you for your attention.

September 20, 1960

Meeting with Fidel Castro

Shortly after noon, Premier Khrushchev arrived at the Hotel Theresa, on 125th Street and Seventh Avenue in Harlem, to pay a visit to Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba. Khrushchev and Castro exchanged opinions on a number of basic international problems and on the forthcoming session of the UN General Assembly.

At the conclusion of the meeting, Khrushchev spoke briefly to radio and newsmen on the sidewalk in front of the Soviet Mission to the United Nations.

The Premier expressed his gratification at the meeting with Castro, and stated:

"I considered it my duty to pay a visit to this heroic man, who raised the banner of struggle of the Cuban people for liberty and independence, the struggle of the poor against the rich, and ensured the victory of the working man. The Soviet people ardently hail this victory and wish the greatest success to the people of Cuba and to their national leader, Fidel Castro."

September 23, 1960

Disarmament, Colonialism, and Other International Problems

*Statement in the General Debate at the Fifteenth Session of the
United Nations General Assembly*

MR. PRESIDENT,
ESTEEMED DELEGATES:

It is my belief that everyone who comes to this rostrum and casts a glance at this hall is aware that he is addressing a very distinguished and responsible assembly.

There is no more responsible gathering of representatives of states than this one should be. Not for nothing is it called the General Assembly of the United Nations. There is no need for me to decipher the meaning of the name our organization bears. I would just like to stress two words out of several others: these are United Nations. Many nations are represented in this hall and they should be united not just by the walls of this hall, but by the common lofty interests of mankind.

Today there are gathered here to discuss major international issues the representatives of now almost a hundred states. Soon we will have amongst us the delegates of new members of the United Nations Organization, and the walls of this hall will, as it were, recede and it will house an even greater number of lands and countries. We must, all of us, welcome this development because we want truly all states to be represented in the United Nations.

It is natural that our thoughts are now centered around what agitates and alarms mankind. Perhaps it is precisely here that the world is seen in all its diversity and, of course, in all its contradictions. It has fallen to our lot to live in the most turbulent but at the same time in the most wonderful time of man's development, and the men and women of the future will envy us.

Much of what but very recently seemed to some to be im-

mutable and eternal has crumbled because it has outlived its time. The new, more progressive, more equitable has established itself. Our epoch is one of the rapid emergence of new forms of the existence of human society, of an unprecedented upsurge to domination over the forces of nature, of an unparalleled upsurge to a more progressive social order. But though we live in the twentieth century it still bears traces of past ages, and more than that, the remnants of barbarism. One of the chief features of this epoch and its very essence is, however, the awakening of the erstwhile backward, downtrodden, and oppressed peoples.

Ours is the age of the struggle for freedom when the peoples are shaking the foreign yoke off their shoulders. The peoples want a worthy life and are fighting for it.

The victory has been won already in many countries and in many lands. Can we relax, however? We know indeed, that tens of millions of people are still languishing in colonial bondage, and are experiencing cruel deprivations.

This is taking place at a time known for its great and promising scientific discoveries. The mind and the hands of man have created a space ship that circles the earth. Man is already capable of sending human beings far beyond our planet. We have split the atom and are penetrating the albumin cell. We are moving on land and above land with astonishing speed, and the vistas of our knowledge are so broad that we ourselves are surprised.

It may seem that everything in our world is perfect. But at the same time who can say that this world of ours is already completely and well arranged, that in it there is no poverty and deprivation. It is worthwhile pondering once again over the fact that, according to United Nations statistics, hundreds of millions of people on different continents are eking out a hungry and miserable existence. Our world is not free from the feeling of alarm for the future, it sees the danger inherent in the division into military groupings and in the ever growing race of nuclear armaments. The great achievements of man's genius can be used to the benefit or to the detriment of mankind. Such is the difficult choice that faces us.

Every thinking individual will contemplate the question of what scientific progress is giving the people, what the great twentieth century is giving them. Some justly say that it has opened up

before the world new horizons, limitless possibilities for creating an abundance of material benefits and for the comprehensive satisfaction of man's requirements. Others are no less justified in pointing to the tremendous danger in that the achievements of science and technology might serve not these noble goals but, in the first instance, the manufacture of horrifying means of extermination. These means of extermination are today inactive. But they are after all manufactured in order to become active.

This argument between the optimists and the pessimists reflects our present-day reality. The main content of this reality is the struggle between two tendencies, two lines in international relationships. Naturally, I am not touching upon the differences in the social systems since these are questions pertaining to the domestic life of the peoples and states, and can and must be resolved by them alone.

This dispute-filled and complicated line of international relationships came into being neither today, nor yesterday. Two points of view regarding world developments plainly opposed one another as early as in the first post-war years. One line aimed at an international detente, at ending the arms race, at the development of international cooperation, and the exclusion of war from the life of society. What a noble and wonderful line this is! It is, indeed, in the name of the triumph of justice that man lives on the earth.

There is, however, a second line, and we have no right to pass over it in silence. This is a line aimed at fanning the "cold war." It leads to an unchecked build-up of armaments, to the destruction of all the foundations of international cooperation with all the ensuing dangerous consequences.

Two lines in international relationships have been in contest for a long time. But if in elementary geometry parallel lines can never meet, in international affairs these lines may collide. And this would be a fearful moment. Just ten or fifteen years ago hardly anyone could foresee the outcome of the struggle between these two lines in international policies.

In 1960, however, a year in which you and I are living, only the blind will not see the way in which the belief in the necessity of preserving peace is ever more definitely and plainly taking root in the minds of the majority of nations.

The peoples of all countries, the workers and peasants, the intellectuals, and a part of the bourgeoisie, except for a handful of militarists and monopolists, want not war but peace and peace alone. And if, therefore, the nations wage an active struggle in order to tie the hands of the militarist monopolist quarters, peace can be ensured.

It cannot indeed be otherwise, for life cannot be squeezed into simple geometrical formulas, since life itself relies on the genuine power of the peaceable states, on the ardent sympathy and support of the overwhelming majority of mankind.

It is precisely in the name of the victory of the cause of peace and tranquility, for the sake of service to the cause of peace and security of the nations that the United Nations was created, and we would like to hope that the decisions that will be elaborated by this session of the United Nations General Assembly will bring us all closer to the achievement of the goal of all mankind—peace and justice.

There exist no more lofty goals than those that face the United Nations. It can take extremely important decisions in the field of preventing the outbreak of a new war, safeguarding the legitimate rights and security of all the nations, it can promote the establishment of fruitful international cooperation.

Evidence of how serious are the problems submitted for consideration by this session, evidence of how acute they have become is provided by the fact that a number of states are represented by statesmen holding leading positions in their countries.

Esteemed delegates, we have embarked upon consideration of the problems that today agitate all the nations. The possibilities of the United Nations have now broadened, and the greater is the responsibility vested in it. I have already referred to the fact that the United Nations has been augmented by a large group of young independent African states. I am happy to have this opportunity to welcome ardently, sincerely and cordially the states recently granted United Nations membership, and to convey to them wishes of wellbeing and prosperity on behalf of the Soviet people.

The road traversed by the representatives of these states was not easy. The peoples of these countries sustained oppression, deprivation, and sufferings. They have come to us after a stubborn struggle for their independence and freedom, and all the more

cordially do we welcome them today. We say to them that they have taken their legitimate and rightful seats as members of the United Nations!

The countries that have cast off the burden of colonialism are a huge and active peace force. From now on the young states of Africa and the Mediterranean will also make their outstanding contribution to the solution of the important and complicated problems facing the United Nations.

I. The Policy of Preparing War and Violating the Sovereign Rights of the Nations Must Be Condemned and Halted

A year ago I already had the honour of speaking from this lofty rostrum. That was a time when highly promising prospects for the invigoration of the international atmosphere had opened up before mankind. Contacts between responsible statesmen from various countries of the world were expanding. The General Assembly adopted a resolution on general and complete disarmament. The Ten Nation Disarmament Committee began its work. Agreement was reached on a Summit Conference. Certain progress was made in the talks on the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests. All this instilled great hopes into the hearts of people in all countries.

No one can dispute the fact that the Soviet Union has never spared any effort to make international relations continue to develop further in this gratifying direction. However, the sinister forces who profit by maintaining international tension cling hard to their positions. These are a small handful of people, but they are fairly influential and greatly affect the policies of their states. No small effort should, therefore, be exerted to crush their resistance. Hardly does the policy of an international detente start to yield appreciable fruits when they immediately launch extreme measures so that the nations should not feel any relief, they go all out in order again and again to force the world back to dark times, to aggravate international tension still further.

We come up against a dangerous manifestation of the activities of these forces last spring when the aircraft of one of the

largest of the United Nations member states, namely the United States, perfidiously invaded the air space of the Soviet Union and other states. Moreover, the United States has promoted such violation of international law into a principle of deliberately pursued state policy.

The aggressive incursion of an American plane into our country and all the subsequent actions of the United States Government have shown the nations that they are dealing with the calculated policy of the United States Government which attempted to supplant international law with piracy, and honest negotiations between sovereign equal states with perfidy.

The whole world knows what a heavy blow this policy dealt to the cause of alleviating international tension. In particular, it was the cause of the breakdown of the Paris Summit Conference which was to have considered the paramount problems of today. Under different circumstances this conference could have laid the foundations for sounder cooperation among states.

However, for some convinced lovers of what does not belong to them the lessons they are taught are of no avail. They are given a sound thrashing, but they think that all their setbacks are due to their carelessness or to the use of inadequate facilities. And then again they try to break into another man's house, but from another entrance this time, and using new devices.

Something of the sort is happening with the initiators of spy flights of American aircraft. I don't know what lessons they drew from the U-2 incident, but exactly two months later, on July 1, they dispatched to us another military aircraft, an RB-47. This plane carried guns and special reconnaissance equipment. The plane penetrated our country from the direction of the Kola Peninsula. For what purposes? In the name of what?

I believe every person of common sense understands that this plane was not bringing us any good cargo.

Incidentally, the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, mentioned in his speech yesterday that an RB-47 American military aircraft was shot down by Soviet forces. I am not going to argue about this matter. The actual state of affairs and our position have already been explained in detail.

But, strange as it may seem, while closely following the President's speech I did not hear him say a single word about the

U-2 plane which was also downed over the territory of the Soviet Union. How can this be explained? Perhaps the President has forgotten about this plane?

What then is the United States trying to do, in fact, by sending its planes into the air space of the USSR? Does it perhaps want to cause an incident which would be followed by rocket talk? One plane, another plane, and, in actual fact, an incident of this sort is staged. Or is this perhaps for the time being only a policy of probing the strength of the other side?

Be this as it may, but one thing is absolutely plain: the provocation-mongers are seeking to create an atmosphere in which the nations would live in constant fear. If such an atmosphere satisfies the United States Government it can in no way satisfy the Soviet Union and the overwhelming majority of other states. We have always striven and will strive for the ending of lawlessness in international relations in all its manifestations!

The Soviet Union is not tendering any demands that are out of the ordinary. We are merely striving for the observance of the most elementary standards of intercourse between states. We merely want the strict observance of the United Nations Charter which excludes methods of violence, brigandry, or aggression, and demands respect for the sovereign rights of all states as the basis of stable peace on earth. Is this so very much? And is this not desired by all honest people on earth who hold dear the destinies of peace, the sovereignty and independence of their countries?

The allies of the United States sometimes rebuke us for criticizing the American government too severely. But to feign kindness, and condescendingly slap the backs of the sponsors of international provocations would mean rendering a disservice to the cause of peace. To fight for peace means to courageously expose any actions which cause a war danger, whatever be their source. This invigorates the international atmosphere very well. Conivance with the provocation-mongers, lenience to them have been shown by experience ultimately to lead to the outbreak of war. History is familiar with not a few such examples which are unfortunate for the destinies of the nations.

The flights of American spy planes are instructive in another respect too. They have demonstrated particularly graphically the danger for peace that is constituted by the web of American mili-

tary bases which has enmeshed dozens of states in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Like a deep source of dangerous infection in an organism these bases destroy the normal political and economic life of states upon which they have been imposed. They block the establishment of normal relations between these states and neighboring countries. Indeed, what kind of normal relations can there be if the people in these neighboring countries cannot sleep in peace, if they are constantly overshadowed by the threat of being subjected to an exterminating blow whenever the American military take it into their heads to launch new provocations.

The United Nations cannot fail to heed the ever more insistent demands of the peoples who are alarmed by the sallies of the enemies of peace. The forms and results of the popular movement for peace and international cooperation in various countries are different, but its meaning, causes and aims are the same: it is a movement of protest against the policy of war and provocations, against the back-breaking arms race, against the foisting upon the nations of a will that is alien and inimical to them.

There are fewer and fewer people willing to reconcile themselves with the present situation when any manifestation of the free will of the peoples, any trends towards the pursuit of an independent policy—whether on the part of Indonesia, Iraq, or Guinea, neutral Austria, or little Iceland which is protecting her economic interests—meet with frantic opposition and evoke thunder and lightning on the part of the powers grouping around NATO, this present-day “holy alliance” of sorts which has assumed the thankless mission of exorcising the spirit of freedom wherever it appears on the globe.

Courageous Cuba has become the object of all kinds of attacks, intrigues, and subversion, economic aggression and finally, poorly concealed threats of intervention.

The relations of the United States with Cuba are illustrative. All the branches of Cuba's economy before the victory of the popular revolution in that country are known to have been dominated completely by American monopolies which gained huge profits out of the exploitation of the Cuban workers and the wealth of their fertile land.

Some people in the United States at times like to boast that

the living standards in their country are higher than those of other countries. There is no doubt about it, the living standards in the United States today are higher than in Cuba. But what is the explanation for this? Is it because the Cuban people are less industrious or because the Cuban soil is less fertile? No, this is certainly not the reason. The diligence of the Cuban people and their love for their homeland and their soil are well known. The reason is quite different. For years the fruits of the Cuban people's labour were used not by themselves but by the American monopolies. After this can anyone be surprised at the fact that the per capita income in Cuba was in 1958, for instance, six and a half times less than it was in the United States? This speaks for itself eloquently.

Now a different order has come into existence in Cuba. Having expelled dictator Batista the Cuban people have freed themselves from foreign exploitation, and have taken their fate into their own hands firmly declaring to the United States monopolists: “No more plundering of our country. We ourselves shall utilize the wealth of our labour and our land!”

Thus, Cuba's purported guilt consists in that the freedom-loving and brave Cuban people wanted to live an independent life. The United Nations must do all it can to remove from Cuba the overhanging threat of interference from outside. To allow matters to be brought to a new Guatemala would mean to give free rein to events whose consequences hardly anyone can now foresee.

Stormy developments have flared up on the African continent. The young Republic of the Congo on the third day after the proclamation of her independence fell victim to aggression. Before the eyes of the whole world the Belgian Government attempted to deprive that country of its freedom, to take back what the Congolese people have been selflessly fighting for over decades. An international crisis developed which brought back to everyone's memory the troubled days of autumn 1956: the days of the Suez crisis. As was the case then, an independent African state fell victim to unprovoked aggression, the universally recognized principles of relations among states were flouted, a situation was created which is fraught with a grave threat to peace not only in Africa.

How ridiculous and absurd are the arguments with which the aggressors have been covering up their actions. They alleged

that "chaos" would reign in the Congo if the Belgian troops had not marched in, that the Congolese people had not yet matured for independent nationhood. Who could believe these allegations? The Africans have a saying which runs: "To cheat the people is just the same as to try to wrap fire in paper." Armed aggression against the Congo has been condemned by the whole of Africa, by world-wide public opinion.

And of course, it was not concern for the life of Belgian citizens in the Congo but the far more tangible interests of the all-powerful monopolies which have taken root on Congolese land that prompted the Belgian Government to undertake the reckless attempt to bring the people of this young state to their knees, to tear away by force its richest province of Katanga. Raw materials for nuclear weapons—uranium, cobalt, titanium, cheap labour—that is what the monopolists are afraid of losing in the Congo. This is what constitutes the genuine basis of their conspiracy against the Congo the strings of which extend from Brussels to the capitals of other major NATO powers.

When the colonialists realized that the government of the Republic of the Congo which was legally elected and enjoyed the confidence of the Parliament had embarked upon the path of a firm independent policy, and set itself the task of working for the interests of the Congolese people, every means was employed by the colonialists to bring down this government. The colonialists decided to get a puppet government created which, posing as an "independent" government, would, in fact, be obedient to the will of the colonizers.

The colonialists tried to bring this about by crude methods and direct interference, as they always do in such cases. Unfortunately, in the case of the Congo they have been doing this unseemly work through the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Hammarskjöld and his staff.

This is shameful. The United Nations forces which were sent at the request of the legal government to help that government have taken over the airports and the radio station, disorganized the life of the state and paralyzed the activities of the legitimate government. The UN troops created conditions for the treacherous acts of the Katanga puppet where forces were rallied and mobi-

lized against the government of Patrice Lumumba which was elected in conformity with all the rules of democratic procedure.

The colonialists and their servitors say that Lumumba is a communist. Lumumba is certainly no communist but he is a patriot of his country and honestly serves his own people in their struggle for liberation from the colonial yoke.

But you, Messrs. colonialists, by your actions are helping the peoples of the colonial countries to eliminate the screen by which you blind the people, obscure their consciousness, spreading various versions about communists. All the peoples will understand—and they will understand it soon—that communists, that a communist party, is a party which really expresses the will of the peoples in their struggle for freedom and independence.

Some organs of the US and British press, encouraged by certain forces, clamour about an alleged Soviet defeat in the Congo.

What can one say of such unwise allegations? First of all, we did not and could not sustain any defeat in the Congo because there neither were nor could there have been any troops of ours or any interference on our part in the internal affairs of the Congo.

It has been and will always be our stand that the peoples of Africa, like those of other continents, striving for their liberation from the colonial yoke, should establish orders in their countries of their own will and choice.

Secondly, we have always opposed and will oppose any interference by imperialists in the internal affairs of the countries liberating themselves from colonial dependence, as well as such unworthy methods as were used in the Congo.

The colonialists seek to dissolve the legitimate government and Parliament with the help of the countries which call themselves the free world, they want to celebrate their victory. But it is as yet too early for them to rejoice for it is a Pyrrhic victory. By their pseudo-victory the colonialists are helping to remove the scales from the eyes of the colonial peoples who see more and more clearly that, while granting independence in form, the colonialists do their utmost to maintain colonial oppression.

The people will not stop half way. They will gird their forces and act with still greater foresight realizing that the struggle for independence is a hard one, that it is necessary to overcome many

difficulties on the way to freedom, to learn to distinguish true friends from enemies.

The struggle started by the Congolese people cannot be stopped. It can be slowed down and hampered. But it is with all the greater force that this struggle will break out and then the people, having overcome all difficulties, will gain full freedom.

The Soviet government has welcomed and is welcoming now the struggle of the colonial peoples for independence and will do its utmost to render moral support and material assistance to the colonial peoples in their just struggle.

The United Nations should demand the re-establishment of order in the Congo so that the Parliament legally elected by the Congolese people can function, so that conditions be created for the normal activities of the legitimate government of the Congo which is headed by Mr. Lumumba and which has and is enjoying the confidence of the Congolese people.

The Soviet Government has placed the Congo question on the agenda of the fifteenth session of the General Assembly. The Assembly should give a rebuff to the colonialists and their stooges and call Mr. Hammarskjold to order so that he should not abuse his position as Secretary General and should discharge his duties in strict conformity with the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the decisions of the Security Council.

It is the opinion of the Soviet Government that a decision should be taken that only the troops of the countries of Africa and Asia should be left in the Congo, those troops remaining there only with the consent of the legally elected Congolese government of Mr. Lumumba and being used only at the discretion of this government in the interests of ensuring the normal functioning of the legitimate government and Parliament of the Congo Republic.

All states which in deeds and not in words want to see the Congo free and independent should refrain from any action which could lead to an infringement of the territorial integrity and independence of the Republic of the Congo.

We are convinced that the Congolese people themselves will cope with the present difficulties and will succeed in establishing order in their country.

We are all witnesses of the fact that many nations are expe-

riencing unceasing hostile acts, brutal pressure on the part of a certain group of states which seek to ignore the legitimate interests and rights of other countries. This fills the international atmosphere with acute conflicts the danger of which is enhanced by the mounting arms race.

It is quite evident that international relations cannot continue to develop on this basis since this would mean sliding headlong towards a precipice. It is the sacred duty of the United Nations to come out in defense of the sovereign rights of states, for the restoration of a firm legal basis in international relations, and for the halting of the arms race.

Unfortunately, the policy of violating the integral rights of the peoples is still to be felt in the United Nations itself. Just take the question of the representation in the United Nations of the great People's China. To block the restoration of the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations only because the socialist order in that country is not to the liking of the ruling quarters of certain Western countries, and, first and foremost, the United States, means to ignore reality, not to desire an easing of international tension and to sacrifice the interests of consolidating international peace and the development of international cooperation for the sake of the narrow political designs of a small group of states. Such a situation is harmful for the cause of peace and humiliating for the United Nations.

This is also attested to by the history of the question of the admission of the Mongolian People's Republic to United Nations' membership. As you know, this question has been discussed time and again for many years. The Mongolian People's Republic, however, up to now has not been admitted to the United Nations. We believe that it is high time to settle this question and admit the Mongolian People's Republic to the United Nations so that it can participate on an equal footing with the other sovereign states in the discussion and solution of vital international problems.

By its very nature and by its destiny the United Nations should have the status of a universal world organization. The existence of the United Nations would lose sense if it were to become a one-sided organization and were to lower itself to the position of an errand boy of this or that military alignment.

II. The Colonial Regime Must Be Completely and Finally Eliminated

Fellow delegates:

The process taking place for all to see of the emancipation and regeneration to independent life of nations which for ages were kept away by the colonialists from the highroad of mankind's development is a great hallmark of our epoch. In fifteen years alone about one and a half billion people, in other words, half the world's population, cast off the shackles of the colonial yoke. Dozens of new national states emerged from the ruins of the old colonial empires.

A new period has started in the history of mankind when the nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America are beginning to take an active part in the determination of the destinies of the whole world together with the nations of Europe and North America. Without recognition of this immutable fact there can be no realistic foreign policy, no policy marching in step with the demands of the times and conforming to the peace-loving aspirations of the peoples.

Is the solution of major international problems conceivable today without the participation of the People's Republic of China? Can these problems be resolved without the participation of India, Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon, the United Arab Republic, Iraq, Ghana, Guinea and other states? Let anyone who thinks otherwise try here, within the United Nations, to ignore the opinion and the votes of the representatives of the states of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. True, in some Western countries the appearance in the United Nations of new Asian and African states causes fear.

More than that, opinions have begun to circulate on ways to limit the further flow of newly emerging states into the United Nations.

As for the Soviet Union, I shall say frankly that we are quite content with the admission of so many new states to the United Nations. We have always opposed and will continue to oppose any curtailment of the rights of nations that have won national independence. We are at one with these states in our common desire to preserve and strengthen peace, to create on our planet conditions for peaceful coexistence and cooperation between coun-

tries irrespective of their state and social systems, as is required by the peaceable principles proclaimed by the Bandung Conference of Asian and African countries. Facts testify that the liberation of nations and peoples that had been under colonial domination leads to the invigoration of international relations, to the expansion of international cooperation, to the consolidation of universal peace.

The peoples of the new states have shown convincingly that they are not only able to get by without control and tutelage on the part of the colonial powers, and can govern themselves but that they are active creators of a new life and incomparably wiser administrators and more careful masters of their property, of the wealth of their country than the colonial authorities.

Early this year I visited India, Indonesia, Burma and Afghanistan. I must say that I was much impressed by the great success in raising the level of the national economy and culture. In those countries we saw large new building projects, dams and roads under construction, the buildings of new universities and institutes.

Can such a picture be seen in the colonies? Such things do not and cannot exist there. There the complete arbitrary rule of the foreigners reigns supreme. Peoples of the colonial countries have not only been deprived of the right to independence and self-government, but their national and human feelings and dignity are insulted and flouted at every step. The foreign monopolies pump out of the colonies all that is of value, they barbarically plunder the wealth by means of merciless exploitation.

Due to the rule of colonialists the economy of the colonies is extremely backward in its development while the working population leads a miserable existence. It is precisely in the colonies that the longest working day is to be found and at the same time the lowest national income, the lowest wages, the highest percentage of illiteracy, the lowest life span and the highest mortality rate.

There is no need here to describe in detail the impoverished state of over 100,000,000 human beings deprived of their rights who are still languishing under colonial bondage. The archives of the United Nations contain more than enough reports of various United Nations commissions, petitions and complaints which characterize the condition of the population of those countries

and territories where the colonial regime of government is still preserved under various names. These documents are an indictment of the ignominious system of colonialism. What is happening in those countries and regions justly evokes profound indignation and revulsion among all honest people on earth. But even in the remaining colonies the time of the serene rule of the foreign oppressors has passed. Though the order in the colonies remains as heretofore the people there are becoming different. They are becoming ever more conscious of their condition and are resolutely refusing to bear the colonial yoke. And when the peoples rise up to struggle for their freedom, for a better life, no force in the world can stop this mighty movement.

Look what is happening in the colonies today. Africa is boiling and swirling like a volcano. The Algerian people have been waging a heroic selfless struggle for national independence for about six years. Ever greater resolve is being manifested in the struggle for their rights by the peoples of Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda, Ruanda-Urundi, Angola, Mozambique, Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia, Sierra Leone, South West Africa, Zanzibar, as well as West Irian, Puerto Rico, and many other colonies.

It should be clear to all that the struggle of the peoples for their liberation cannot be checked by any means or force, because this is a great historic process which is going on with ever growing irreversible force. The domination of this or that state over another can be prolonged by a year or two but, just as in the past the bourgeois system came to replace feudalism, and just as today the socialist system is replacing capitalism, the slavery of colonialism will yield to freedom. Such are the laws of human development and only adventurers can expect that mountains of corpses and millions of victims would stop the arrival of a radiant future.

Colonialism should be done away with for it brings misfortunes and suffering not only to the peoples of enslaved countries. Misfortunes and suffering, tears and privation also fall upon the shoulders of the peoples of the home countries. Who can say that French mothers whose children are dying in the fields of Algeria are less unfortunate than the Algerian mothers who bury their sons in their own land.

Now when the blood of colonial peoples is being shed one

cannot turn away or close one's eyes to this bloodshed, and pretend that peace reigns supreme. What kind of peace is this when savage wars are raging, wars which at that are unequal from the point of view of the conditions the combatants find themselves in. The troops of the colonial powers are armed to the teeth with all modern means of killing people, while the peoples selflessly fighting for their liberation are armed with obsolete primitive weapons. But whatever wars of extermination the colonialists should wage the peoples fighting for their liberation will be victorious.

There are countries where sympathies toward the struggle of oppressed peoples are great but they are rather afraid to spoil their relations with colonial powers and therefore do not raise their voice against wars of extermination and put up with colonialism. Others are themselves colonialists and there is nothing to be expected from them. The colonialist policy with all its atrocities is supported by the allies of the colonial powers in aggressive military blocs.

The overwhelming majority of mankind has long since arrived at its final verdict regarding the colonial regime.

The Soviet Union faithful to the policy of peace and support to the struggle of oppressed peoples for their national independence which was proclaimed by V. I. Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state, is urging the United Nations to raise its voice in defense of the just cause of liberating the colonies, and to undertake prompt action towards the complete elimination of the colonial regime of administration.

Complete and final elimination of the colonial regime in all its forms and manifestations has been prompted by the entire course of world history in the last decades. This regime is doomed and its death is a matter of time. Practically the question now is whether the burial of the colonial regime will be quiet or whether it will be accompanied by dangerous gambles by the supporters of colonialism who clutch at extreme measures. The events in the Congo are a fresh reminder of existing dangers.

The United Nations called upon to serve the strengthening of peace and security of nations is duty bound to do its utmost in order not to allow new flareups of military conflicts in Asia, Africa and Latin America arising out of the clash between the colonial powers and the peoples fighting for their freedom and

independence. Is it necessary to prove that any great power can be involved in the orbit of such a conflict and then inevitably the war, local at first, will grow into a general war, a world war?

It is not enough merely to be on the defensive against the intrigues of the colonialists surviving one international crisis after another. It is necessary to firmly safeguard mankind against these intrigues, to make the world secure from colonial military adventures. It is necessary to do away with colonialism once and for all, and to throw it into the rubbish heap of history.

Who else but the United Nations should take a stand in favour of the elimination of the colonial regime of administration since, according to the Charter, the duty of the United Nations is to affirm faith in the rights of man, in the dignity and value of the human being, in the equality of rights of nations, big and small. How can one develop friendly relations between nations on the basis of respecting the principle of equality and self-determination of nations which is the aim of the United Nations and at the same time reconcile oneself to a situation where, as a result of the predatory policy of powers strong militarily and economically many a nation of Asia and Africa can win the right to determine its own fate only at the price of tremendous sufferings and sacrifices, only by armed struggle against oppressors. How can one "achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion"—you will probably have noticed that I was quoting Article I, paragraph 3 of the aims and objects of the UN Charter,—and at the same time shut one's eyes upon such a shameful phenomenon of present-day human society as is the colonial regime.

Is it not time to mount the final offensive against colonialism as a century or more ago civilized mankind launched an offensive against the slave trade and slave-driving, and buried them, thus opening up ample scope not only for the political but also for the economic development of society.

The Soviet Government believes that the time has come to raise the question of the complete and final elimination of the

colonial regime of administration in all its forms and shapes so as to do away with this shame, this barbarism and savagery.

When I was preparing my statement, I knew that not all the participants of the General Assembly would welcome the Soviet Union's proposals, because along with the representatives of the free and independent states there are sitting here representatives of colonial powers as well. And they are hardly likely to welcome our freedom-loving proposals.

Firmly adhering to the principle that the United Nations is the centre for coordinating the actions of nations in achieving the universal aims proclaimed in its Charter the Soviet Government submits for consideration by this session of the General Assembly a draft Declaration in which the following demands are solemnly proclaimed:

1. *To grant immediately to all colonial countries, trusteeship territories and other non-self-governing territories complete independence and freedom in the building up of their own national states in conformity with the freely expressed will and desire of their peoples. The colonial regime, colonial administration in all its forms should be abolished completely so as to make it possible for the peoples of such territories to determine their destiny and form of government.*

2. *To eliminate likewise all strongholds of colonialism in the shape of possessions and leasehold areas on the territories of other states.*

3. *The governments of all countries are called upon to observe strictly and consistently the provisions of the United Nations Charter and of this Declaration relating to equality and respect for sovereign rights and territorial integrity of all states without exception allowing no manifestations of colonialism, no exclusive rights or advantages for some states to the prejudice of other states.*

Being convinced that the complete elimination of the regime of colonial administration will be a noble act of genuine humaneness, a great stride forward on the way of civilization and progress we ardently urge all governments represented in the United Nations to support the provisions of this Declaration.

The draft Declaration prepared by the Soviet Government and submitted for your attention outlines in detail the considerations by which we were guided in raising this question at the

General Assembly. We request that this draft Declaration be circulated as an official document of the UN General Assembly.

In this statement made in the general debate I should also like to make the following points.

The adoption by the United Nations of measures for the complete elimination of the colonial regime would not only create favorable conditions for localizing and cooling the existing cauldrons of military danger where an armed struggle between the colonialists and the peoples fighting for their independence is being waged, but would also greatly diminish the possibility of new military conflicts between states in these areas of the world. The peoples of the countries who are now suffering from humiliations brought about by foreign domination would gain a clear prospect of peaceful liberation from the foreign yoke, and the states clinging to their colonial possessions would be held responsible to the United Nations, to world public opinion for the implementation of the provisions of the proposed Declaration. Of course, such a prospect will become reality only in the event that the colonial powers do not evade the implementation of the UN decisions.

No one may forget what great changes the elimination of the colonial regime would institute in the life of the peoples of the enslaved countries. This would be not only a triumph of elementary human fairness and international law which the United Nations must strive for not in words but in deeds, but would also unite nations, backward as a result of age-long oppression, with the benefits of modern science, technology, culture and social progress.

It is difficult to overestimate the tremendous importance of the elimination of the colonial regime for the entire world economy. It is common knowledge that the economy of colonies and trusteeship territories is today subordinated to the vested interests of foreign monopolies, while the industrialization of these countries has been artificially held in check. Imagine that the situation has changed and these countries and territories, having become independent, obtain the possibility of extensive utilization of their rich natural resources, of industrialization, while their populations lead a better life. This would result in a colossal growth of the world market's capacity which would undoubtedly exercise a favourable influence not only on the economic development of the coun-

tries of the East but on the economy of industrially developed Western countries as well.

A positive role in overcoming the age-old backwardness of the countries that are being liberated would be played by economic and technical assistance under the auspices of the United Nations and on a bilateral basis. Of course, this will require considerable funds. Where can they be obtained without overburdening the population of industrially developed countries? Once again from this rostrum I draw your attention to such a source as disarmament.

The allocation of only one tenth of the funds which the great powers are spending for military purposes would increase the amount of assistance to underdeveloped countries by ten billion dollars a year. And the whole integrated construction of one of the world's largest power systems in the Ingui area of the Congo which is capable of making a tremendous area in Africa blossom is estimated at five billion dollars.

It is also pertinent to recall that it is the moral duty of states that possessed colonies in the past to return to the liberated peoples of those countries at least a part of the values taken by them through cruel exploitation of the population and through pillage of the natural resources.

It could be said that it is easy for the Soviet Union to speak for the elimination of the colonial regime since the Soviet Union has no colonies. Yes, this is so. We have neither colonies nor capital in other countries. But there was a time when many nationalities that populate our country experienced the heavy oppression of tsarism, of the landlord bourgeois system. The conditions of remote areas of the tsarist empire hardly differed from those colonies because they were severely exploited by autocracy, by capitalism. If autocracy looked upon the peoples of Central Asia, Trans-Caucasia and other nationalities that lived in the Russian empire as upon a source of profit, after the October revolution when these peoples obtained complete freedom they promptly raised their economy, culture and wellbeing.

Let us take, for instance, the Soviet Republics of Central Asia. Now Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kirghizia, Turkmenia, Tadjikistan—all the sister republics of Central Asia have turned from backward colonies of tsarist Russia into advanced industrially developed socialist republics. During the period from 1913 to 1960 the out-

put of major industries increased by over 60 times. The industrial production per capita of Kazakhstan, a backward land in the past, equals that of Italy and its per capita power output is higher than in Italy and is at the same level as in Japan.

Before the revolution only 7 million kilowatt-hours of electricity was produced in the territory of Central Asia and Kazakhstan which is 300 times less than in the whole of the Russian empire, while today the annual output of power is 19 billion kilowatt hours, that is 9 times more than in the entire pre-revolutionary Russia.

The peoples of the Soviet Union are engaged in peaceful creative labor for the successful implementation of the targets of the seven year plan for the development of the USSR national economy for 1959-1965. As a result of the realization of this plan the total industrial output in the USSR will increase during the seven year period approximately twofold. The power output in the country will increase more than twofold and in Central Asia almost threefold.

Already today the Central Asian republics' power output per capita is about 800 kilowatt-hours a year, i.e. considerably more than in any Latin American republic. The Soviet Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan produce many times more power than such neighbouring states as, for example, Turkey, which generates 95 kilowatt-hours per capita, Iran—36 kilowatt-hours, Pakistan—11 kilowatt-hours.

The economy and culture of other relatively small nationalities of the Soviet Union, united in autonomous republics, have immeasurably grown. Thus, for example, the output of the major industries of the Yakut ASSR during the period of 1913-1959 increased by 53 times, the Komy ASSR—by 109 times, the Tatar ASSR—by 147 times, the Bashkir ASSR—by 163 times.

In the family of equal socialist republics the former border lands of pre-revolutionary Russia which were threatened with extinction from malnutrition and diseases turned into flourishing land where the living standards have grown in the same way as in the whole of the Soviet Union. Wages and salaries of workers and employees there do not differ in amount from those in other republics of the Soviet Union. Along with all the citizens of the

USSR they are provided with pensions, sick pay and other social benefits.

Still more striking is the success of the Soviet Union's national republics in the development of culture. It is known, for instance, that before the revolution the nationalities of Kazakhstan and the Central Asian republics were almost entirely illiterate. There were almost no people with secondary and higher education. Soviet power has opened for all peoples broad access to education and culture. Illiteracy of the population of Kazakhstan and the Central Asian republics as well as illiteracy of the population of the other republics of the USSR is now done away with and they, like the whole of the USSR, have become republics of overall literacy.

Before the revolution in Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kirghizia, Tadjikistan and Turkmenistan there were no institutions of higher learning—and in Kirghizia, Tadjikistan and Turkmenistan even no technical schools—whereas last year 211 thousand students studied in those republics in the institutions of higher learning and 176 thousand students in the technical schools and other secondary specialized institutions. For every ten thousand citizens of these republics there are on the average 88 students of institutions of higher learning and 73 students of technical schools not counting large numbers of young people who went to study beyond the borders of their republics—to Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Kharkov, Saratov, Novosibirsk, Tomsk and other centres of culture. I would recall that in France there are only 40 students in institutions of higher learning for every ten thousand citizens, in Italy—34, and in West Germany 31, that is, almost three times less than in Soviet Central Asia.

One of the decisive factors guaranteeing the successful development of the economy and culture of the national republics is the growth of skilled cadres of workers and intellectuals.

May I cite here a few figures taken from the results of the latest census and compare them with those of the census of 1926, the year when our economy was already completing its return to the pre-revolutionary level. During this period the total number of workers and employees in the national economy increased sixfold in the Soviet Union and tenfold in Central Asia and Kazakhstan.

Still more considerable was the increase of skilled workers

and specialists. Here, for example, are the figures for some professions (in thousands of people):

		1926	1959	Times by which numbers grew from 1926 to 1959
Metal workers	The whole of the USSR	993	9304	9
	Central Asia	29	528	18
Chemical workers	The whole of the USSR	44	395	9
	Central Asia	0.23	16.6	72
Mechanics	The whole of the USSR	121	1781	15
	Central Asia	3.7	155	42
Drivers, tractor and combine operators	The whole of the USSR	22	5684	260
	Central Asia	0.8	754	943
Engineers, technicians and agronomists	The whole of the USSR	267	4683	18
	Central Asia	9.3	349	38
Teachers and other workers of culture and education	The whole of the USSR	486	3276	7
	Central Asia	18	342	19
Doctors and skilled medical personnel	The whole of the USSR	199	1702	8.5
	Central Asia	6	147	24
Scientific workers	The whole of the USSR	14	316	23
	Central Asia	0.36	26.5	74

Tremendous success in the development of economy, culture and science was achieved, of course, not only in the republics of Central Asia which were particularly backward in the pre-revolutionary period, but in all other Soviet republics as well. Thus, for example, in all the Union Republics academies of science have been established and there exist a great number of scientific research institutes and institutions of higher learning. In all republics in the years of the Soviet rule qualified cadres of the working class have been trained and the numbers of intellectuals greatly increased.

After the Great October Socialist Revolution the bourgeoisie of the whole world kept harping about the inevitable end of the power of the Soviets because Russia was a country of poor education and the working class had no specialists capable of running the state machinery and the country's economy. Life has

proved the truth of Lenin's words that the revolution would awaken popular initiative and that Soviet power would produce leaders and organizers from amidst the masses and that the common worker and peasant having taken power would learn to govern the state, would master all achievements of modern science and technology.

The tsarist government pursued in the border lands of Russia an essentially colonial policy which differed but little from what can be seen today in colonial countries. Uzbeks, Kazakhs, Tadjiks and other nationalities were scornfully called "aliens." They were not considered as human beings and were severely exploited. National differences, hatred and discord were stirred up between these nationalities, and the tsarist empire was held together only by bayonets and subjugation. When the peoples of Central Asia and Trans-Caucasia were given national freedom and equal rights with other nationalities of Russia they showed their capabilities in the development of national economy and culture.

Did the development of our country suffer from the granting of the right to independence and self-determination to the peoples? Are there strife and enmity in our multinational country between nationalities or disintegration of the state? No, such is not the case. There neither is nor can be anything of the sort.

According to the Constitution each of our 15 Union Republics has the right to remain in the Union or leave it if it so desires. The existence of 19 autonomous republics, 9 autonomous regions and 10 national territories makes it possible to preserve the national features and cultural originality of each people and nationality.

Accord and an unprecedented cohesion of all nationalities have been achieved in the Soviet Union. Genuine friendship between nationalities was brought into being which all the trials of the second world war could not shake. It was not only the national minorities who gained from these great changes but also the Russians, Ukrainians, and Belorussians—the nations comprising the majority of the Soviet Union's population.

We are proud that on the experience of the former border lands of Russia it has been completely proved that it is possible for the countries of the East to do away with backwardness, poverty, diseases, and ignorance within the life-time of one generation and to rise to the level of economically advanced countries.

And now may I turn to other factual examples which illustrate how the colonialists exercise their "civilizing mission" in the colonies.

Upon the attainment of independence by the former colonies the national annual per capita income according to official UN statistics was in Indonesia only 25 US dollars, while in Holland it was 20 times higher. In Burma this income was 36 dollars, in India—57, that is, ten times less than in Great Britain. The national per capita income in Belgium at the time the Congolese people won their independence was 13 times higher than the income of a Congolese. And, at that, in the Congo, as well as in other colonial countries, the lion's share of this extremely low income was taken by the colonialists.

Let us take such an important index of a country's economic development as the output of power. At the attainment of independence the output of power in Burma was 4 kilowatt-hours per capita a year, in India—about 15 kilowatt-hours, in Pakistan—2 kilowatt-hours, in Egypt—about 50 kilowatt-hours while in Great Britain in 1947 the per capita output was over 1100 kilowatt-hours.

The colonialists kept the enslaved nations in ignorance and darkness. In 1950 the number of literate persons in Indonesia was not higher than 15 to 20 per cent. In India even a few years after independence had been won, when measures had already been taken to develop the national education system the literacy level was 16 per cent, in Pakistan it was 14 per cent. By the time the countries of French Indo-China attained independence there were 330 students in France for each 100 thousand citizens and 4 in Cambodia. In 1948 in Indonesia there was one doctor for 67 thousand citizens. It is not surprising that as a result of the poor living standards and due to the lack of the necessary medical aid the average life span in all former colonies is appallingly low in comparison with the home countries. In a number of these countries a man lives on the average not more than 35 years which is almost half the span in the countries that held them in colonial enslavement. This is the heritage of the colonial system which is yet to be overcome.

If the home states had really been guided by the interests of the colonial peoples, if they had really rendered them assistance about which they like to talk instead of engaging in plunder and

exploitation, the peoples of the colonies and the home countries would have developed equally and would not have differed so strikingly in the development of the national economy, culture, and welfare. But what kind of a commonwealth is this when the living standards of the Western countries and the colonies stands no comparison. This is not a commonwealth but domination of one over another, with some using the labour and values of others, exploiting and plundering, pumping the national resources into the home countries. The colonial peoples have only one way out of their misery and lack of justice—the elimination of the colonial regime.

The advocates of the colonial regime intimidate the peoples of the home countries alleging that after the elimination of the colonial system the life of the population of industrially developed countries would drastically deteriorate. The groundlessness of such assertions is obvious.

First of all such assertions completely give away their authors who involuntarily admit that the home countries are continuing to plunder the colonies and dependent countries and gain fabulous profits. And this is really so, but it is also known that the super-profits go not to the broad strata of the home country's population but mainly into the pocket of the monopolies. It is not the peoples of the home countries but the millionaires and billionaires who cling to the colonial regime.

Secondly, the experience of the development of many countries that have gained national independence shows convincingly that with the rapid growth of the national economy the internal market in these countries becomes incomparably more capacious, so that they can consume incomparably more industrial products from the more developed countries and at the same time on the basis of the uplift of their productive forces produce more raw materials, various products and goods necessary for the economy of industrially developed countries. This is a more progressive and reasonable system of relations between countries that leads to a further rise in the well-being of the peoples of both the colonial and dependent countries that were economically backward in the past, and the more developed countries.

The entire course of life, of economic and political develop-

ment passes the inexorable judgment of history upon the outdated shameful colonial regime.

Of course, one cannot expect that our proposals regarding the elimination of the colonial regime, which meet the vital interests of mankind, will find sympathy on the part of those who are still clinging to the colonial order. I can hear in advance the critical voice of the defenders of the colonial regime. But we say to those who are accustomed to build their welfare at the expense of the oppressed peoples in the colonies: think it over, take a look at what is going on around you. If not today then soon, very soon, the colonial order will finally perish, and if you do not get out of the way in time you will be swept away. Neither by plots nor by the force of arms can one add life to the doomed colonial regime. All this will only strengthen and embitter the struggle of the peoples against this completely rotten regime.

But the supporters of the colonial regime are growing fewer and fewer even in the colonial powers themselves, and in the long run the last word is not theirs. Therefore we appeal to the sense and foresight of the peoples of the Western countries, to their governments and representatives at this distinguished assembly of the United Nations: let us unite in action aimed at the elimination of the colonial regime and thus accelerate this commutable historical process, and do our utmost so that the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries become able to decide their own fate.

We welcome the sacred struggle of the colonial peoples against the colonialists and for their liberation. If the colonial powers do not heed the voice of reason and continue their old colonial policy of keeping colonial countries in subjugation, the peoples who support the position of eliminating the colonial regime should render all-out assistance to the fighters for their independence against colonialism, against colonial slavery. Moral, material and other assistance should be rendered for the completion of the sacred and just struggle of the peoples for their independence.

The Soviet Union on its part has been rendering assistance to the economically underdeveloped countries and will be rendering such assistance on an ever-growing scale. We sincerely help the peoples of those countries in the establishment of their independent economy, in the development of their national industry

which is the mainstay of real independence and of the uplift of the people's welfare.

Nations who oppress other nations cannot themselves be free. Every free nation should help the peoples still oppressed to win freedom and independence.

May I express the hope that this session of the General Assembly will become an historic landmark on the way to the complete and final elimination of the colonial regime on our planet. This will be an act of great historic importance expressing the aspirations of all nations struggling for national independence, of all progressive mankind.

III. The Disarmament Problem Must Be Solved

Esteemed ladies and gentlemen! Last September on the instructions of the Soviet Government I submitted to the fourteenth session of the UN General Assembly the proposals of the Soviet Union on general and complete disarmament. The enormous destructive power of modern weapons, the unprecedented scope of the arms race, the accumulation by states of huge stockpiles of the weapons of mass extermination all create a threat to the future of mankind and make it imperative to seek an approach, new in principle, to the disarmament problem. Our proposals are the practical expression of such an approach.

One could not but experience a feeling of gratification due to the fact that the ideas raised by us were unanimously approved by the United Nations and received wide support by the peoples of the whole world. Being guided by the resolution of the last session of the General Assembly the Soviet Union together with other states took the most active part in the negotiations in the Ten Nation Committee on Disarmament and bent its efforts in it to elaborate a treaty on general and complete disarmament. Without waiting for an international agreement on the question of disarmament the Soviet Union is implementing unilaterally a reduction of its armed forces by 1,200,000 men, i.e., by one third, which is generally recognized to have contributed to improving the atmosphere for the negotiations on disarmament.

The Soviet Government consistently and determinedly pur-

suing a peaceful policy solemnly declares at this session of the UN General Assembly that the Soviet Union maintains its armed forces only for the defense of our country and for the fulfillment of obligations to our allies and friends in case of aggression against them. The possibility of our armed forces being used for other purposes is ruled out since this would be alien to the very nature of our state and to the fundamental principles of its peaceful foreign policy.

Our country is compelled to maintain armed forces only for the reason that our proposals on complete and general disarmament have not yet been accepted. We shall do everything we can so that general and complete disarmament becomes reality and mankind is saved from the arms race and the threat of a new destructive war.

One year has elapsed since the General Assembly adopted the resolution on general and complete disarmament. By the present pace of life this is comparatively a long period. And there should be no doubt that those who are engaged in the production of arms, in modernizing and designing new death-dealing means have not wasted this time.

But in the sphere of disarmament no progress has been reached in the year that passed. What are the reasons for such a situation about which one has to speak with great regret and serious alarm? Who is hindering the implementation of the General Assembly resolution on general and complete disarmament—this perhaps the most important and outstanding decision in the history of the United Nations? Who is preventing the deadlock in the disarmament problem from being broken?

The facts prove that the lack of any progress in the solution of the disarmament problem is the consequence of the position taken by the United States and some other states connected with it through NATO.

Throughout the work of the Ten Nation Disarmament Committee the Western powers refused to proceed to the working out of an agreement on general and complete disarmament seeking by every possible means to evade a discussion of the substance of the Soviet programme of general and complete disarmament transferred by the General Assembly to the Committee for detailed consideration. On their part they put forward proposals which

provided neither for general nor complete disarmament, nor for disarmament at all, but only for measures of control over armaments, that is, control without disarmament. However, one cannot fail to see that the establishment of control without disarmament would amount to the establishment of a system of international espionage, and not only would it fail to promote the consolidation of peace but might, on the contrary, aid a potential aggressor in carrying out his plans that are dangerous for the peoples.

The danger lies in the fact that the establishment of control over armaments if armaments are retained means in effect that both one and the other side will know the quantities, qualities and deployment of the armaments possessed by the opposing side. Consequently, an aggressor could increase his armaments to a superior level in order to choose a convenient opportunity and launch an attack. We will never accede to control over armaments without disarmament because this would mean encouraging the aggressor. Our goal is to ensure stable peace which can be achieved only through the elimination of armaments and armed forces under strict international control.

Acting contrary to the UN General Assembly resolution the Western powers in the Ten Nation Committee indulged in nothing but meaningless talk about disarmament trying to hinder any possible progress in this matter, and to discredit the idea of general and complete disarmament in the eyes of world public opinion.

The Soviet Government as well as the governments of a number of other states found itself forced to interrupt its participation in the work of the Ten Nation Committee which had been turned by the Western powers into a screen to cover up the arms race. It was not easy for the Soviet Government to take this decision because it was our country that sponsored the question of general and complete disarmament and exerted every effort to come to a constructive solution of this problem in the Committee in complete accord with the General Assembly resolution, but in the existing situation staying in the Committee would only amount to helping the opponents of disarmament. The fact could not be tolerated that the great cause of disarmament was being made an object of speculation for purposes hostile to the interests of universal peace.

That is why the Soviet Government has put the question of disarmament up for consideration by the United Nations General

Assembly, the considerable majority of whose members is in no way interested in the arms race and sincerely wishes its termination. Taking into account the great importance of the disarmament problem and the necessity to make a radical change in the course of negotiations, the Soviet Government voiced the opinion that in considering this question at the General Assembly the Heads of State and Government vested with the necessary power should directly participate. We note with gratification that this attitude was met with due understanding by the governments of quite a number of states whose delegations at the General Assembly are led by the most responsible statesmen of their countries.

Bringing the disarmament question to the plenary meetings of the General Assembly we proceed from the fact that consideration of this question in all its scope should lead, at least, to its solution or, at least, give a more concrete direction to the disarmament negotiations, in which there should now participate alongside those states belonging to the opposing military groupings the states adhering to a neutral course.

Seeking to facilitate the work of the General Assembly and to make the discussion of the disarmament problem more specific the Soviet Government submits for consideration by the General Assembly its proposal "Basic provisions of the Treaty on general and complete disarmament." We request the President of the General Assembly and the UN Secretariat to circulate this proposal among the delegations as an official document of the General Assembly as well as our explanatory memorandum which presents the position of the Soviet Government on the disarmament problem in greater detail.

The new Soviet proposal on the question of general and complete disarmament which has as its basis the provisions of the Soviet Government's proposals of June 2, 1960, which were submitted for the consideration of all the governments of the world has been drawn up with due regard for all the useful points which were made during the past year in the course of the discussion of this question by political and public circles of various countries of the world. In many respects this proposal meets half way the position of the Western powers which, as we hope, will facilitate an early agreement on disarmament.

We now provide, in particular, for the elimination of all

means of delivery of nuclear weapons to their target as early as in the first stage of general and complete disarmament, include a detailed elaboration of measures for effective international control in all the stages and take into account the wishes of some Western powers that the reduction of the strength of the armed forces and conventional armaments should be provided for from the outset. Quite a number of other changes and modifications were brought into our programme. All these changes, in our opinion, make the programme of general and complete disarmament more concrete and even more realistic and practicable.

The detailed elaboration of the Agreement on general and complete disarmament is, of course, a complicated task for the solution of which all the participants in negotiations should exert much effort and labour. Various questions may arise in the course of this work the solution of which would demand flexibility and realistic appraisal of the international situation.

But we should all be aware that no flexibility will help the solution of the disarmament problem and all the efforts and labour devoted to this aim will, as hitherto, be wasted if not all the participants in the negotiations are guided by a sincere desire to realize mankind's eternal dream of disarmament.

However, such a desire was obviously lacking in the Ten Nation Committee insofar as the USA and its NATO partners were concerned. So far, there is still no evidence that they have such a desire. In this connection one cannot ignore the new attempts to sidetrack the whole matter which were undertaken by the USA not long before the General Assembly started its work. Is it not clear to everybody that the USA pursued precisely this aim when it tried to get the convocation of the UN Disarmament Commission only a few weeks before the opening of the General Assembly session? The experience of the work in the Ten Nation Committee showed that there arose difficulties in the negotiations in the Committee on practical problems of disarmament as a result of the unwillingness of the Western powers to solve the disarmament problem. The proposals of the Soviet Union submitted for consideration by the Ten Nation Committee are widely known and have been appreciated by world public opinion as quite clear and realistic. It is necessary to emphasize that they took into account some wishes and proposals of the Western powers. Neverthe-

less Mr. Lodge, the US representative in the United Nations Disarmament Commission, alleged that the Soviet Union was proposing buying a pig in a poke. In this case one may wonder whether Mr. Lodge, like the hero of oriental fairy tales, has not put himself into a poke which prevents him from seeing what is well seen and understood by all.

We were also surprised by another statement by Mr. Lodge who opposed submitting the disarmament question for consideration by this session of the General Assembly. He said he believed that world public opinion should hear all this and hear it in such a forum as this Commission which dealt exclusively with disarmament and not merely hear it all at the General Assembly where it would be but one of more than 80 items.

I am personally acquainted with Mr. Lodge and knowing that for many years he represented the interests of the United States of America in the United Nations I am surprised that he is of so low an opinion of his own labour. However, that may be precisely the reason, since Mr. Lodge has become so accustomed to the questions under discussion at the General Assembly that he counts them by scores and hastens to refer them to an auxiliary body so as to hide them from public opinion in a poke.

We regard with respect all the commissions of the United Nations but for us the United Nations General Assembly is the most representative and authoritative forum of the peoples. We hope that the representatives of states of all continents present here do not share such a point of view and will not consider the disarmament question as a 79th problem. This is the cardinal question which agitates the whole of humanity, and it is strange that this is not realized by the representative of the United States of America at the United Nations.

Even less disguised attempts were made in the UN Disarmament Commission to channel the negotiations on disarmament in such a direction that thereafter no solution of this problem can be found. How otherwise can be evaluated the proposals of the USA put forward in the UN Disarmament Commission to the effect that the USA and the USSR should each transfer under international supervision 30 thousand kilograms of fissionable materials for nuclear weapons purposes—this, by the way, was also repeated by the President of the United States yesterday—or that these

countries should start closing down, one after another, plants producing such materials for military purposes?

Only an ignorant person can believe that these proposals are aimed at reducing the threat of nuclear war. Indeed, the US proposals do not provide either for elimination of nuclear weapons or destruction of their stockpiles or even the prohibition of their use. They provide for the removal of certain amounts of fissionable materials from the existing stockpiles of these materials which have been accumulated by states for military use. It is well known, however, that at present the existing stockpiles of fissionable materials are so huge that they are more than enough to annihilate whole countries and peoples. It is no accident that when putting forward its proposals the USA kept silent about the quantity of nuclear weapons and fissionable materials for their future manufacture that will remain at its disposal after the allotment of 30 thousand kilograms. If they had mentioned this, it would be even more evident that such a step would not substantially alleviate the threat of nuclear war.

The Soviet Government is deeply convinced that only a radical solution of the disarmament problem which would provide for the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons together with the cessation of their manufacture and tests and the destruction of all accumulated stockpiles of these weapons can fully accord with the task of delivering mankind from the threat of nuclear war looming over it. That is precisely the goal which the Soviet Union is trying to achieve, persistently and resolutely advocating general and complete disarmament.

All this, in our opinion, leads to an important conclusion: to break the deadlock in the disarmament problem at last, the General Assembly should call to order those who impede the solution of the disarmament problem, who try to supplant businesslike negotiations on disarmament with meaningless beatings about the bush.

Objectively appraising the situation and the correlation of forces existing in the world the Soviet Government is deeply convinced that disarmament in our time is not only necessary but possible. The struggle for peace has now become a great banner mobilizing the peoples. Even those governments which,

as before, are suffering from an inclination to the "cold war" policy and to the armaments race cannot afford to ignore it.

The United Nations has no other, more important and urgent task than to contribute to the cause of disarmament becoming a real fact and promoting at last the initiation of practical deeds, namely: the return of soldiers to their homes, the destruction of weapons including nuclear weapons and means of their delivery.

A great aim is worth great effort. The Soviet Government expresses the hope that all the states concerned about consolidating peace will exert their energy and will spare no effort to solve the disarmament problem, this most important problem of today. There can be no doubt that the peoples, the world over, will greatly appreciate the decision of the United Nations General Assembly on the disarmament question.

IV. Peaceful Co-existence Is the Only Sensible Path for Developing International Relations in Our Time

Ladies and gentlemen! The peoples of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government are unfailingly striving for the principles of peaceful co-existence to be firmly established in relations between states, for these principles to become the cardinal law of life everywhere in present-day society. Underlying these principles is not some "gimmick" invented by the communists but simple things dictated by life itself, namely that relations between all states should develop in a peaceful way, without resort to force, without wars, without interference in the internal affairs of one another.

I will not disclose a secret by saying that we entertain no liking for capitalism. But we do not want to foist our system upon other countries. So let those, who determine the policy of states whose social system differs from ours, also abandon their fruitless and dangerous attempts to dictate their will. It is high time for them too to admit that the choice of a way of life is the internal concern of every people. Let us build up our relations taking into consideration the actual facts of reality. This will mean peaceful co-existence.

One cannot disregard the fact that a force, much greater than a wish, a will or the decisions of any government, is acting in

favour of the policy of peaceful co-existence. This force is the desire which is natural and common for humanity, to avert the calamities of war in which all the unprecedented means of mass extermination, accumulated in the course of recent years, would be used. It stands to reason that acceptance of the principles of peaceful co-existence does not mean that it is necessary to begin building up relations between states on a completely new basis. In fact, peaceful co-existence is already a reality and has found international recognition. The proof of this is that the General Assembly has twice in the recent period adopted resolutions reaffirming the need for peaceful co-existence. Whether they want it or not, even those states whose governments still do not want to voice their approval of the ideas of peaceful co-existence, are forced to practice them in many respects.

In fact, the question now is how to make peaceful co-existence secure, how to prevent departures from it which now and then give rise to dangerous international conflicts. In other words, as I have already said once, the choice we have is not great: it is either peaceful co-existence which would promote the best human ideals or else co-existence "at dagger's point."

If one is to speak about the actual shape of peaceful co-existence one might point to the relations maintained by the socialist countries with the new states of Asia, Africa and Latin America which have set themselves free from the oppression of colonialism and embarked upon the path of independent policy. Typical of such relations are friendship, great mutual sympathy and respect, economic and technical assistance to less developed countries without any political or military strings attached. The relations of the countries of the socialist camp with neutral capitalist states such as, for instance, Finland, Austria, Afghanistan, Sweden and others can also be cited as another good example.

I think the ideas of peaceful co-existence may triumph even in those countries whose governments have not yet abandoned either hostile acts against the socialist states or rude pressure on non-committed states which pursue an independent policy. In these countries too the realization is growing of the danger of the "cold war" policy and the folly of balancing on the brink of the precipice.

When I was last in the United States I met statesmen, businessmen, workers and farmers, scientists and trade union leaders. These meetings had for me, and also, I think, for the people I met, great importance. My conviction has grown that the American people do not want war, that in the highest strata of the American society there are people who deeply understand the necessity to live in peace and rule out war from the life of mankind, people who are able to go against deeply rooted prejudices.

I left the United States with the thought that there exist practical possibilities to remove from the relations between our states the gloomy shadows of suspicion, fear and distrust, that the Soviet Union and the United States could go hand in hand in the name of consolidating peace and establishing effective international co-operation of all states. I must say that this conviction was not shaken despite all that took place between the United States and the Soviet Union in the recent months. In our time it would be sheer nonsense if the two most powerful nations could not come to terms between themselves. This should be done at least in virtue of the great importance of the relations between the USSR and the USA for the destinies of the world. The Soviet Government is ready to go on doing its best to improve relations between our country and the United States of America.

The policy of peaceful co-existence presupposes willingness to solve all outstanding issues without resort to force by means of negotiations and reasonable concessions. Everyone knows that during the years of the "cold war" such questions chiefly did not find their solution which led to the creation of dangerous hotbeds of tension in Europe, Asia and in other parts of the world as well.

The international knots which are the heritage of the Second World War are still entangled. First and foremost among them stands the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and the solution on this basis of the crucial question of West Berlin. If a peace treaty with Germany has not so far been concluded this is completely on the conscience of the governments of the Western powers which to speak without beating about the bush have been sabotaging this problem in the course of many years. These governments have got into the habit of outright rejection of all the Soviet Union's proposals on a German peace treaty while at the

same time they themselves over the fifteen years that have elapsed since the war did not find a suitable occasion to come forward with their own proposals in this respect.

As a result of this the situation in Europe remains unstable, fraught with the danger of acute conflicts. The absence of a peace treaty can gladden most of all the revanchist and militarist forces in West Germany. They are taking advantage of this so as step by step to move forward towards the realization of their purposes which are dangerous for the cause of peace. At the time of the war in Korea when the relations between the great powers were aggravated they came forward with the question of creating the Bundeswehr and succeeded in this. Today we are the witnesses of agitation by the ruling circles of the FRG who hope that the present tense moment will allow them to pocket nuclear and rocket weapons.

Despite the fact that the scheduled summit conference which was to have considered among others the question of a peace treaty with Germany was disrupted, we believe that there exist objective conditions for an agreed solution of questions left open after the last war. As we have already stated the Soviet Government is prepared to wait a while with the solution of the question of a German peace treaty to try to achieve agreement on this treaty at the summit conference which the Soviet Union has proposed be held in a few months' time. We would like to hope that the Soviet Union's efforts in this direction will be supported also by the governments of the USA, Great Britain and France.

The Soviet Union believes that the solution of the Korean question is most essential for the consolidation of peace in the Far East and in the whole world.

Only madmen can contemplate solving the Korean question through the use of armed force.

The sole correct proposal—to leave the solution of the question of the peaceful reunification of Korea to the Koreans themselves without any interference from outside—finds ever growing recognition. The necessary condition for this is the immediate and complete withdrawal of all American troops from South Korea whose presence poisons the atmosphere not only in Korea, but in

the whole of the Far East and made possible such shameful facts as the falsification of elections in South Korea.

The proposal of the Government of the Korean People's Democratic Republic about a confederation of North and South Korea is as reasonable as the proposal of the Government of the German Democratic Republic on setting up a confederation between the two German states. This is the only way to a good start for the peaceful reunification of these states.

During the recent years at sharp turns of international life the peaceful states were compelled more than once to come forward in defense of the just cause and to take effective measures to direct developments into a peaceful channel. The United Nations helped to rebuff the aggressors who made attempts upon the freedom and rights of Egypt, it helped to call to order the interventionists in Lebanon and Jordan. We would like to hope that the United Nations will successfully accomplish the responsible tasks dictated by the world situation which is still disturbing.

The experience of the work of the United Nations has demonstrated that this body is useful and necessary because in it are represented all states which are called upon to resolve the pressing issues of international relationships by negotiations so as not to bring them to such a state that conflicts and wars might break out. This is a positive aspect in the work of the United Nations. This, indeed, constituted the main objective in the creation of the United Nations.

In the course of the United Nations activities, however, some of its negative aspects also came to light. These negative aspects found their expression in the fact that so far certain countries succeed in imposing their will and their policy in the solution of specific matters in the United Nations to the detriment of other states. This does not further the basic goal of this Organization, does not promote the adoption of such decisions as would reflect the interests of all the countries making up the United Nations.

The executive machinery of the Organization is also constituted partially. It often approaches the solution of questions from the standpoint of a certain group of countries. This is particularly true of the activities of the United Nations Secretary General. As a rule the Western countries that make up the military blocs of

the Western powers exploit this post in their interests by nominating for the post of United Nations Secretary General a candidate that is acceptable to themselves. The result is that in many cases the practical routine work of the United Nations and of its Secretariat is in effect carried out one-sidedly. The personnel of the Organization is picked one-sidedly as well.

Partiality in the implementation of practical measures on the part of the United Nations was particularly manifested in the events that flared up in the Congo. Mr. Hammarskjold, the Secretary-General, in implementing the decisions of the Security Council, in effect sided with the colonialists and with the countries that support the colonialists. This is a very dangerous thing.

We have come to the firm conclusion that the time has come to create conditions for more effective work both of the United Nations as a whole and of this Organization's executive working body. I repeat, the matter concerns primarily the Secretary-General and his staff. The necessity of certain changes and improvements should particularly be borne in mind in the light of the immediate future.

For instance, we are now conducting negotiations on disarmament. For the time being the United States and its allies are doing their utmost to resist general and complete disarmament, and are seeking all sorts of pettifogging pretexts to thwart or at least to stave off indefinitely the solution of the disarmament question. But we believe that common sense will prevail and sooner or later all states will influence those who resist a reasonable solution of the disarmament problem. Therefore the United Nations machinery should now be adapted to the conditions that will come into being in the course of the implementation of a disarmament decision.

An identical point of view has materialized in our proposals as well as in those of the countries making up the NATO military alignment regarding the necessity to follow up agreement on disarmament with the creation of armed forces of all countries under international control to be used by the United Nations as decided by the Security Council.

The Soviet Government believes that if the question of utilizing these international armed forces is approached correctly they

really can be useful. But the experience of the Congo puts us on our guard. This experience indicates that the United Nations forces are being used precisely in the way against which we warned and which we resolutely oppose. The Secretary-General, Mr. Hammarskjöld, has taken the stand of merely formal condemnation of the colonialists. In actual practice, however, he is pursuing the line of the colonialists, is opposing the legitimate Government of the Congo and the Congolese people, is supporting the renegades who, under the guise of fighting for the independence of the Republic of the Congo are in fact continuing the policy of the colonialists and are apparently getting remuneration from them for their treachery.

What is to be done in this case? If this is the way in which the international armed forces will in practice be used, that is, to suppress the liberation movement, then under such conditions it will naturally be difficult to reach agreement on the creation of international armed forces since there will be no guarantees of their not being used for reactionary purposes alien to the interests of peace. Provision should be made to guard against any state falling into the same predicament in which the Republic of the Congo now finds itself. We are sure that other states also understand this danger. Such solutions should therefore be sought as would exclude similar occurrences in the future.

The Soviet Government has come to a definite conclusion on this point and wishes to expound its point of view at the United Nations General Assembly. Conditions have obviously matured when the post of the Secretary-General—who alone governs the staff and alone interprets and executes the decisions of the Security Council and sessions of the United Nations General Assembly—should be abolished. It is expedient to renounce the system under which all the practical work in the period between General Assembly sessions and Security Council meetings is determined by the Secretary-General alone.

The executive body of the United Nations should reflect the actual situation that obtains in the world today. The United Nations includes states parties to the military blocs of the Western powers, socialist states and neutralist countries. This would therefore be completely justified, and we would be guaranteed to a

greater extent against the negative developments which came to light in the work of the United Nations especially during the recent events in the Congo.

We consider it reasonable and just for the executive body of the United Nations to be constituted not as one person—the Secretary-General—but as three representatives of the states belonging to the three basic above-mentioned groups who could be invested with the lofty trust of the United Nations. The crux of the matter is not even in the name of this body but in that this executive body should represent the states parties to the military blocs of the Western powers, the socialist states, and the neutralist states. This composition of the United Nations executive body will create conditions for a more correct implementation of the decisions taken.

In brief we consider it expedient to set up instead of a Secretary-General who is presently the interpreter and executor of the Assembly and Security Council decisions a collective executive body of the United Nations comprising three persons each of whom would represent a certain group of states. A definite guarantee would thereby be created that the work of the United Nations Executive would not be conducted to the detriment of any of these groups of states. Then the United Nations executive will really be a democratic body, it will really safeguard the interests of all United Nations member states irrespective of the social and political systems of the various states making up the United Nations. This is particularly necessary at the present time, and will be the more so in the future.

There exist other inconveniences as well which the United Nations members are now experiencing. These inconveniences are caused by the location of the United Nations Organization. It would seem that the United States of America which calls itself a free democratic country should do its utmost to facilitate the work of the United Nations, to create all necessary conditions for the representatives of states constituting this organization. Practice shows, however, that the United States restricts and curtails the rights of the representatives of various states. Facts are known, for instance, of the representatives of young African and Asian

states being subjected to racial discrimination in the United States and, moreover, to attacks by gangsters.

The representatives of the United States authorities explain the various restrictions of the rights of representatives of states in the United Nations by the fact that it is allegedly difficult for them to ensure their security. I wish to emphasize that we are of a better opinion of the hospitality of the American people than that which may result from such statements and restrictions. But these statements cannot be overlooked and, likewise, the inconveniences cannot fail to be taken into account which are put in the way of the work of the United Nations in these instances.

The question arises of whether or not thought should be given to the choice of another locale for the United Nations Headquarters which would better facilitate the effective work of this international organization. Switzerland or Austria might well be such a place, for example. I can declare in all responsibility that if it should be considered expedient to house the United Nations Headquarters in the Soviet Union we guarantee the best possible conditions for its work, complete freedom and security for the representatives of all states irrespective of their political or religious convictions, and of the colour of their skin since in our country the sovereign rights of all states, the equality of all nations, big and small, are held in high esteem.

You all know that in the past the Soviet Government supported the proposal that the United States of America be chosen as the locale of the United Nations. However, recent developments show that the United States is evidently irked and burdened by this. Then perhaps the release of the United States from such a burden should be contemplated.

* * *

Ladies and Gentlemen: Addressing the delegates to the United Nations General Assembly with proposals on these essentially important questions of our time the Soviet Government would like to stress their specific, extraordinary significance for the destiny of the world.

The importance of the disarmament problem requires no

special proof. This question is of such vital importance that it, certainly, has to be discussed at the plenary session of the General Assembly.

The question of the elimination of the colonial regime is also so vital that the necessity of its discussion at the plenary session of the General Assembly will apparently meet with full understanding by all the delegates.

We believe that especial importance has been acquired by the question of the aggressive actions of the United States against the Soviet Union which found their expression in the despatch of American planes into Soviet air space. This is a fact which by itself goes beyond the limits of the relations between states admissible in time of peace. But this question assumes particular importance also for the reason that the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, himself declared the aggressive flights of the American planes a normal business allegedly necessary for the security of the United States. At the same time the US Government arbitrarily assumed the right to send such planes in future. This is why since the matter concerns the violation of the sovereign rights not only of the Soviet Union but of other states as well the question of aggressive actions of the United States must be dealt with by the United Nations at its plenary session.

The continuation of such actions and especially their interpretation by the US President as state policy can at any moment plunge mankind into a third world war. Therefore, I repeat, it is the opinion of the Soviet Government that this question as well as the questions of disarmament and the elimination of colonialism must be discussed at the plenary session of the United Nations General Assembly and not in the Committees.

The matter concerns the representatives of the overwhelming majority of states of the world expressing at this session of the General Assembly their opinions on the cardinal problems which today agitate public opinion and all people on earth who are interested in the further development of freedom and democracy and yearn for peace for themselves and their children.

The Soviet Government hopes that the questions submitted for consideration at the present United Nations Assembly will

meet with support and understanding, since they are motivated by the sincere desire to secure a better life and tranquillity on our planet.

Indeed, man lives and works in order to put to good use all his strength, all his faculties and his possibilities. The world in our time is diversified but at the same time it is one. We live on the same planet and it will depend on us in what way we shall arrange affairs on it.

Man's mind works wonders today. Tomorrow even more boundless prospects will be revealed in the field of science and technology. The question is one of the great scientific achievements of our age being harnessed to the good of the peoples.

I think you will share my opinion that the attention of hundreds of millions of people is focused today on the General Assembly hall. What do the peoples of many countries of the world expect from us? A just and honest decision on the crucial problems of our time. Peoples may be mistaken in their choice of governments. One or another historical situation may lead to injustice in any country. But, however complicated the internal relationships in states may be, people are apt to hope and believe in the best. People want to live and prosper, and the main thing is that they want their children to possess more and live better.

That is why we all, and I am saying this on behalf of the Soviet people, should be inspired with the understanding of our high and particular mission. Mankind has advanced so far ahead that it cannot tolerate in its life the remnants of the grim reactionary past. Mankind has advanced so far ahead that it realizes the deep and grave danger of misusing scientific discoveries for the sake of the arms race.

So let us leave to our successors, our children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren good memories of our time. Let them take the men of our time as an example and say: once the inhabitants of the earth had complicated and most difficult problems. And they, having come together at the United Nations Assembly, resolved them, succeeded in settling them in the name of a better future.

So let us act in such a way as to make the fifteenth session of

the United Nations General Assembly become an Assembly not only of hope but of the realization of hopes.

The Soviet Government is ready to do its utmost so that colonial slavery should collapse today, that today questions of disarmament should find their concrete and businesslike solution.

The Soviet Government is ready to do its utmost to achieve today the prohibition of the nuclear weapons tests so that this means of mass extermination can be banned and destroyed.

It could be said that these are complicated questions, which cannot be solved at one go. But these are questions presented by life and they must be settled before it is too late. The solution of these questions cannot be evaded.

Concluding my address I wish to emphasize once again that the Soviet Government, guided by the interests of the Soviet people, by the interests of the citizens of the free socialist state, once again is proposing to all: let us talk, argue, but let us solve the questions of general and complete disarmament. Let us bury colonialism that has been condemned by mankind.

No further delay is tolerable, no further procrastination can be tolerated. The peoples of all states, irrespective of the social systems of these states, are expecting the United Nations General Assembly at last to adopt decisions meeting the aspiration of the peoples.

Thank you.

September 23, 1960

Statement of the USSR Government on Disarmament

*Submitted for Consideration by the Fifteenth Session
of the United Nations General Assembly*

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has submitted for consideration by the General Assembly of the United Nations the question of disarmament and of the state of affairs as regards the implementation of the resolution of the previous session of the General Assembly on this question.

The disarmament problem is the cardinal problem of today on whose solution largely, if not chiefly, depends the preservation of peace. This is now recognized by all states. At the same time the Soviet Government is deeply concerned over the failure thus far to make any headway in the settlement of this problem.

Today the states have already stockpiled and continue stockpiling huge quantities of nuclear weapons and the means of their delivery to the target in any part of the world. This in itself gravely endangers peace since among the countries possessing nuclear weapons there are those which proclaim brinkmanship and gross violations of the sovereignty of other states as their state policy without stopping short of such methods as are usually employed in wartime.

At a time when the states possess huge stockpiles of nuclear weapons every new step in the arms race enhances the danger of the so-called accidental outbreak of war as well. Inaccuracies in the work of the radar system can lead to misinterpretation of the radar signals which may result in a start of military operations and, consequently, in unprecedented disaster. A misunderstanding of orders by pilots who, according to the United States Government, make routine bomber flights carrying atomic weapons may lead to these bombs being dropped on the territory of another state with all the ensuing consequences. Malfunctioning of electronic devices in military nuclear rocket systems may also set off the chain reaction of war conflict.

If the nuclear arms race continues, it will be more and more difficult to prevent such "accidents."

The arms race is one of the major factors increasing distrust and suspicion in the relations between states and poisoning the world atmosphere. The "cold war" hated by the peoples is a product of the arms race, hampers its elimination and makes the arms race all the more dangerous for states and peoples.

The ending of the arms race is a way toward the consolidation of peace. The solution of the disarmament problem would also yield great economic gains. Disarmament would release enormous material and financial values which could be used for the good of mankind.

Over a hundred billion dollars has again been burnt in the huge furnace of war preparations in the one year that has elapsed since the fourteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly which unanimously approved the idea of general and complete disarmament. Simple calculations show that these resources would be enough to bring about a radical technical and economic reconstruction of the entire African continent. This money could be used to feed hundreds of millions of starving people for a year; only one per cent of the total sum of the military outlays of states would be enough to build more than a hundred fully equipped universities in countries which are greatly in need of highly qualified specialists. The money spent on the building of a single American nuclear powered submarine would suffice to build at least 50 houses with 100 flats each or 10,000 cottages. Such are the losses sustained by humanity due to the arms race!

Taking into account the fact that for many years the negotiations on isolated disarmament measures were invariably deadlocked by the Western powers, a year ago, at the fourteenth session of the UN General Assembly the Soviet Union proposed an entirely new approach to the solution of this problem, and put forward *the idea of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.*

Life itself has prompted the raising of the question of general and complete disarmament, as in the age of nuclear weapons and powerful rockets partial or halfway disarmament measures cannot fully eliminate the danger of war.

Only general and complete disarmament can ensure the solution of this great problem. Only general and complete disarmament can secure lasting peace and tranquillity for mankind.

In raising the question of general and complete disarmament the Soviet Union which is today generally recognized to be one of the mightiest military powers of the world was proposing on its own initiative to forego this military might forever, to eliminate it completely, provided other Great Powers follow suit. If the United States, Great Britain, France and the other Western powers are ready to do so, it only remains to agree on how better to translate this into reality. But if they are not ready it means that their statements that they desire peace and that they need armaments only for defense against possible aggression are not to be believed.

Therein lay the core of the Soviet Union's proposal on general and complete disarmament.

The new approach to the solution of the disarmament problem stems from the very nature of our country's socialist system. Vladimir Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state, used to say that disarmament is an ideal of socialism. Indeed, the socialist states do not need armaments for any other purposes except defense against possible attack from the outside and ensuring the preservation of peace throughout the world. The Soviet Armed Forces have not and cannot have any other objectives, for the foreign policy of socialism is a peaceful and humane foreign policy. And if the Western powers agreed to the renunciation of armed forces and armaments, to the elimination of the means of waging war the socialist states would have no need whatsoever for armed forces and armaments and there would be no reasons for maintaining rocket troops, army, navy, air force and anti-aircraft defense. None of these is needed for the successful building of communism in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Our lands are rich in natural resources, our people like to work, science and technology render good service to our cause.

War is not needed for the triumph of communism, since the struggle for the communist ideas is waged not between states but between the classes inside each state. It is a slander on socialist countries to accuse them of trying to impose their ideas on other peoples and other states by means of war.

At the fourteenth session the Soviet Government did not confine itself to raising the question of general and complete dis-

armament; at the same time it placed before the United Nations a concrete programme for such disarmament.

Trying to facilitate as much as possible the settlement of the disarmament problem, and to create an atmosphere conducive to negotiations on this problem the Supreme Soviet of the USSR made a decision to reduce the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union by 1,200,000 men, i.e. by one-third. This decision is being scrupulously carried out.

Now that a year has passed since the Soviet Union put forward the question of general and complete disarmament it can be said with certitude that the idea of general and complete disarmament has been supported by all peoples who want this idea to be realized as soon as possible. And this is but natural since the peoples of all countries—not only socialist but capitalist alike—want peace, want to see the world free of armaments and free of wars between states. Neither the Soviet people, nor the American, British, French, Chinese people, nor the peoples of Africa, Asia, Latin America and Australia want war.

The will of the peoples for peace found its expression in the resolution of the last session of the General Assembly on general and complete disarmament which, as you all remember, was adopted unanimously: not a single state opposed the resolution, all of them supported it. Even those states which were stepping up the armaments race and continue to do so, and which, as experience has proved, did not intend, in fact, to give up the brink of war policy, did not dare at the time to voice open opposition to general and complete disarmament.

The General Assembly declared in its resolution that the question of general and complete disarmament is the most important question facing the world today, called upon the governments to make every effort to reach a constructive solution of this problem and expressed the hope that measures for general and complete disarmament under effective international control would be worked out in detail and agreed upon at an early date. This laid down the general line of disarmament negotiations. It was decided to conduct the negotiations within the framework of the Ten Nation Committee.

The peoples of the world reposed their best hopes in those negotiations. They wanted to believe that now all states, and par-

ticularly the Great Powers possessing the most powerful weapons, would find a new approach to the disarmament problem and agree at last on its practical solution.

A year has passed since that time. Unfortunately it has to be stated that this year was lost insofar as disarmament is concerned. This is an alarming result which cannot and must not be ignored.

What has happened? Why did it prove impossible to take a single step forward towards the implementation of the said resolution though a year has already passed since its adoption by the General Assembly? Why did the negotiations in the Ten Nation Committee on Disarmament fail to produce any positive results?

One should turn to the facts to answer these questions. And the facts prove that again, as in the past, two opposing lines, two positions have clearly and definitely emerged in the course of the negotiations in the Ten Nation Committee.

One of them was in line with the demands of the peoples for an early settlement of the disarmament problem. The other one was in direct contradiction with those demands and was a poorly camouflaged attempt to prevent disarmament.

The line of militating for general and complete disarmament was pursued in the Ten Nation Disarmament Committee by the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Roumania, Bulgaria, i.e. by the socialist states. The line of opposing the solution of the disarmament problem was followed by the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, Canada, i.e. by the Western powers—members of the North Atlantic military bloc.

Our position in the course of the negotiations was crystal clear: the socialist states proposed to get down to business as soon as possible, to start the practical solution of the problem, to discuss in a businesslike way a programme of general and complete disarmament and to work out an appropriate treaty.

The stand taken by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries was flexible throughout the negotiations. The delegations of these countries in the Committee expressed their readiness to hear with due attention and respect all the remarks, proposals and considerations of the Western powers with regard to the Soviet programme of general and complete disarmament that would be aimed at a speedy settlement of this vital task. The

Soviet Government has proved its readiness by its deeds. It was prepared to consider any other realistic programme for disarmament.

When we learned from the conversations with the President of France, General de Gaulle, that the French Government thought it advisable to start disarmament with the elimination of the means of delivery of nuclear weapons to the target, the Soviet Government treated the idea in all seriousness and having given it thorough thought made a substantial amendment to the programme of general and complete disarmament. The amended programme provided for all the means of delivery of nuclear weapons to the target being eliminated in the first stage of general and complete disarmament. The Soviet Government agreed to this, being guided by the desire to facilitate agreement, though it is common knowledge that the Soviet Union has superiority in the most effective modern means of delivery of nuclear weapons, namely in intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The Soviet Government met the Western powers halfway in a number of other questions as well.

The United States and the Western powers sought from the Soviet Union a more specific and detailed description of the control system in our programme of general and complete disarmament. The Soviet Government took into account this consideration also. The amended Soviet proposals set forth comprehensively and with many details a plan for the establishment of a control system and the implementation of strict international control over all disarmament measures. Now no one can assert, unless he wants to contradict the facts, that the Soviet Union is evading the establishment of strict international control over measures for general and complete disarmament. It goes without saying that at the same time the Soviet Government is in favour of control over disarmament while strongly objecting to all attempts to impose control over armaments, i.e. control without disarmament which, as every one will understand, would merely be a legalized system of international espionage.

After all, the establishment of control over armaments, if armaments are retained, means, in effect, that both one and the other side will know the quantities, qualities, and deployment of the armaments possessed by the opposing side. Consequently, an

aggressor could increase his armaments to a superior level in order to choose a convenient opportunity and launch an attack. We will never accede to control over armaments without disarmament, because this would mean encouraging the aggressor. Our goal is the winning of stable peace which can be achieved only through the elimination of armaments and armed forces under strict international control.

For instance, in case agreement is reached on the destruction, in the first stage, of all means of delivery of nuclear weapons to the target, on the dismantling of foreign military bases on the territories of alien states, and the withdrawal of foreign troops from those territories, then appropriate measures for control over the carrying out of these arrangements should also be worked out.

The same applies to the subsequent stages of disarmament.

Such is the stand of the USSR as regards the questions of general and complete disarmament under effective international control which the Soviet Government took in the course of negotiations in the Ten Nation Committee and still adheres to. No one can deny that this is a positive stand prompted by the desire to reach agreement on general and complete disarmament as soon as possible.

Yet all the efforts made by the Soviet Union and other socialist states to have the Ten Nation Committee act in accordance with the General Assembly resolution and take up the task of a practical solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament ran, as it were, against a stone wall of opposition on the part of the United States and other Western powers. Our partners in the negotiations stubbornly refused to start the elaboration of a treaty on general and complete disarmament and in every way dodged a discussion of the substance of the Soviet programme of general and complete disarmament. For the outside world they say "yes" on disarmament questions, but when it comes to the consideration of the disarmament question as such, they make every effort to prevent agreement on disarmament.

The United States of America for its part made proposals which provided for neither general, nor complete disarmament, nor any disarmament at all, but only measures of control over armaments, which is in fact, tantamount to control without disarmament. This wholly applies to the so-called "western plan" of

March 16, 1960 and the so-called "new" American proposals which were put forward by the United States when the Ten Nation Committee had already suspended its work.

What then did the Western powers propose? They proposed control over rockets, control over satellites, control over atomic industry, control over the deployment of armed forces, financial control, ground control, control by means of aerial photography—and all this with the states retaining all their armed forces and armaments including nuclear weapons and all means of their delivery to the target. The question, when framed in such a way, may be of interest to those who while hatching military gambles are concerned about collecting secret information on the armed forces and armaments of other states, but has nothing to do with disarmament. One cannot but see that the establishment of control without disarmament would not only fail to contribute to the consolidation of peace but would on the contrary make it easier for a potential aggressor to realize his plans which present danger for the peoples.

But the Western powers in the Ten Nation Committee did not wish to discuss anything except control without disarmament. As the only specific measure for the first stage, beyond control, they proposed that the strength of the armed forces of the USA and the USSR be limited to the level of 2,500,000 men though it is known that this is precisely the present strength of the United States armed forces whereas the Soviet armed forces will number 2,423,000 men on the completion of a unilateral reduction by one third, i.e. even less than proposed by the Western powers. Then why was the proposal about the levels of 2,500,000 men made at all?

It is difficult to evaluate this attitude otherwise than as the unwillingness of the Western powers to agree to disarmament.

Not only did the Western powers reject a businesslike discussion in the Ten Nation Committee of the Soviet programme of general and complete disarmament, not only did they put forward no proposals of their own which would accord with the demands of the resolution of the General Assembly on general and complete disarmament, but they even went back on their own proposals as soon as they were accepted by the Soviet Union.

It has to be stated, for instance, that though France put

forward a proposal to begin disarmament with the elimination of the means of delivery of nuclear weapons to the target, its representative in the Committee of ten in fact took the line of abandoning this proposal as soon as it was accepted by the Soviet Union, and began advocating not the elimination of the means of delivery but only control over them. One need not be a specialist to understand the difference in principle between the elimination, destruction of rockets, military aircraft, warships and other means of delivering nuclear weapons to their target, and the establishment of control over them.

The fact that the French Government changed its view as regards giving priority to the elimination of the means of delivery of nuclear weapons to the target is all the more incomprehensible since it is well known that in rocketry, that is in the most advanced means of delivery, France is far from being the first. The time is not far off when she can be outstripped even by West Germany which the Pentagon intends to supply with strategic rockets. Consequently, if agreement were reached on the elimination of the means of delivery of nuclear weapons to the target, France, far from standing to lose, would on the contrary, gain inasmuch as she would be on a par with the other powers which are ahead of her now as far as the means of delivery are concerned. There arises a legitimate question: are not NATO commitments more important for France than the settlement of the disarmament problem?

It is obvious that with the USA and its allies taking a negative stand as regards general and complete disarmament, the Ten Nation Committee was not able to do any fruitful work towards the implementation of the resolution of the General Assembly. Moreover, from a body for negotiation on disarmament it began to turn into its exact opposite: an instrument covering up the continuation of the arms race.

Suffice it to say that while the Ten Nation Committee was holding talks on disarmament, military appropriations continued to grow in the United States, the construction of American nuclear-rocket bases was stepped up in Britain, Italy and a number of other states, a new military treaty with the USA was imposed on Japan against the will of her people, preparations began for supplying the West German revenge seekers and militarists

with "Polaris" strategic nuclear rockets, and steps were taken to expand the production of chemical and bacteriological weapons of mass extermination. In other Western countries—members of NATO—the arms race was given a new impetus as well.

All that was being carried out with the Ten Nation Committee being used as a screen. On the one hand, the arms race was being stepped up, war preparations on an ever growing scale were going on at a feverish pace, and on the other, allegations were being made in the Ten Nation Committee about a desire for disarmament, for continued negotiations. It was becoming more and more apparent that the USA and its NATO allies sought, as before, to drown the disarmament problem in futile disputes.

Under the circumstances, the Soviet Union and other socialist states found themselves faced with the problem of whether there was any sense at all in the further work of the Committee. After giving due consideration to the situation that was created through the fault of the USA and its allies the Soviet Government could not but draw the conclusion that it was necessary to interrupt its participation in the work of the Ten Nation Committee and to raise the question of the necessity of considering the disarmament problem at the General Assembly. The same conclusion was arrived at by the other socialist states—members of the Committee.

It was not easy for the Soviet Government to make such a decision, for it was precisely the Soviet Government that had put forward a programme of general and complete disarmament, it was the Soviet Government that sought to display maximum flexibility in the course of the negotiations and worked persistently for the negotiations to be effective and to make progress. Notwithstanding all this, it had to take this step. To do otherwise would be helping those who do not want disarmament, those who are still pushing the world to war.

Now that the United States and its allies have brought the disarmament negotiations in the Ten Nation Committee to an impasse, the General Assembly should give the present situation due consideration and take appropriate measures with a view to removing all obstacles in the way of solving the disarmament problem. To achieve this it is necessary to declare bluntly and plainly on behalf of all the states of the world to those who hamper the negotiations on disarmament:

It is high time to put an end to maneuverings and delays, the solution of the disarmament problem cannot be postponed any longer, the elaboration of a treaty on general and complete disarmament cannot be put off any more!

To expedite the solution of the disarmament problem the Soviet Government is submitting to the General Assembly its proposal entitled "Basic provisions of a treaty on general and complete disarmament" which is appended to this statement. The Soviet Government believes that this proposal provides a good basis for the elaboration and conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament. In this proposal the Soviet Government is going still further to meet the Western powers and takes into account their attitude on some major points including their pronouncements that *it would be advisable, beginning with the first stage, to couple measures for nuclear disarmament with measures to reduce armed forces and conventional armaments*. To this end the Soviet Government proposes that a substantial reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments should be provided for as early as in the first stage.

What is the essence of the Soviet proposal?

The Soviet Government proposes that *within four years or any other agreed period all states should carry out in three subsequent stages the complete and final elimination of all their armed forces and armaments*. At the same time all measures for disarmament must be strictly controlled so that not a single state could shirk the fulfillment of its obligations under the treaty on general and complete disarmament and consequently, so that none of them could take advantage of the elimination of the armed forces and armaments of other states for aggressive purposes.

In the first stage which is to last for about a year or a year and a half manufacture of the means of delivery of nuclear weapons to the target must be stopped and the existing stockpiles destroyed. In the first stage, too, all foreign military bases on the territories of other states must be dismantled and all foreign troops withdrawn from such territories. The strength of armed forces of states must be substantially reduced, with the maximum strength of the armed forces of the USSR and the USA being established at the level of 1,700,000 men. Conventional armaments must be reduced accordingly.

The implementation of all these measures would mean that in a year or a year and a half after the disarmament treaty becomes effective not a single state would have at its disposal military rockets or military aircraft capable of carrying atomic and hydrogen bombs, or warships equipped for this purpose, or any other means which could be used for delivering nuclear warheads to their destination.

Not a single foreign military base—rocket, air, naval or any other—would remain on the territories of states. All foreign troops would be withdrawn from the territories of other states whether or not they are occupation troops or stationed at present on foreign territories in accordance with some agreement. The armed forces and conventional armaments of states would be considerably reduced. It would be no exaggeration to say that were all these disarmament measures carried out, the world would heave a sigh of relief since the arms race would be stopped, the danger of a surprise nuclear attack by one state on another would be eliminated and, in general, the threat of a sudden outbreak of war would be considerably reduced. All this is, of course, bound to have a beneficial effect on the international situation as a whole.

However, the implementation of the disarmament measures proposed by the Soviet Government for the first stage would not as yet entirely remove the threat of war. Even after that the states would still retain nuclear and other weapons of mass extermination. But without the means of delivery nuclear weapons cannot be used to harm other states. Therefore the means of delivery must be destroyed and control must be established to prevent their manufacture. The states would still have considerable armed forces and conventional armaments. In other words, the states would still maintain means of unleashing war.

Therefore, the Soviet Government proposes that immediately following the completion of the measures of the first stage that are to be carried out from beginning to end under strict international control, and after the International control organ and the Security Council satisfy themselves that all the states have fulfilled their obligations for the first stage, the states should proceed to the realization of other large-scale disarmament measures comprising the second stage.

In the second stage the Soviet Government proposes, among other measures, the complete prohibition of nuclear, chemical, biological and other kinds of weapons of mass extermination as well as discontinuance of their manufacture and destruction of the existing stockpiles of such weapons, and further reduction of the armed forces of states alongside the appropriate reduction of armaments and war material.

The implementation of these large-scale measures would mean that there would be no more weapons of mass extermination left in the world, while armed forces and conventional armaments would be substantially reduced. Obviously, this would reduce to a minimum the possibility of war flaring up between states.

Nevertheless, even this is not as yet a complete and final solution of the problem now facing humanity. If the states retain armed forces—even though on a limited scale—it will mean that the danger of war has not yet been ruled out from the life of human society. But if so, how can one be sure that the arms race will not start again and the world will not return, in the long run, to the present state of affairs?

The Soviet Government believes that *in the third stage* it will be necessary to go still further and complete the elimination of the armed forces and armaments of all states, stop war production, abolish war ministries, general staffs, and military and paramilitary institutions and organizations of every kind as well as to stop appropriating funds for military purposes.

On the consummation of the third stage of general and complete disarmament the states would have neither soldiers, nor weapons any longer, and the danger of war would be consequently eliminated once and for all. Then the centuries-old dream of humanity—a world free of arms, free of wars—would come true.

As to the internal security of states it would be ensured by strictly limited and agreed contingents of police or militia. In case of need states would place such contingents at the disposal of the United Nations Security Council for the maintenance of world security.

These are the major points of the Soviet proposal "Basic provisions of a treaty on general and complete disarmament."

The Soviet Government expects that the members of the United Nations will consider the proposal "Basic provisions of a

treaty on general and complete disarmament" with all seriousness and responsibility. The Soviet Government expresses the hope that the discussion of this proposal at the General Assembly will make it possible to proceed without delay to the practical solution of the disarmament problem and will provide a more specific line for the solution of this problem during negotiations in an appropriate working organ. As to the composition of such a working body it appears necessary that besides states belonging to the existing military blocs, wider opportunities in considering the disarmament question should also be given to states adhering to neutral positions. It should also be desirable that the main areas of the world should be represented in such a disarmament body.

The Soviet Government realizes that the working out of a treaty on general and complete disarmament will require patience, mutual regard for the interests of the parties and flexibility on the part of all the participants in the negotiations. The Soviet Government, as before, is ready for such negotiations. It is aware that the peoples of the world, anxious for the radical solution of the disarmament problem are eagerly waiting for practical measures for general and complete disarmament to be initiated as soon as possible.

Of course, an important step ensuring the success of the negotiations on disarmament would be the re-establishment of the legitimate rights of the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations. Thereby the great China would become a party to the negotiations on the disarmament question.

The peoples of the world persistently demand a prompt solution of the disarmament problem. They expect that the United Nations General Assembly will speak out with authority on this vital problem.

Goodwill and determination are required for the solution of the disarmament problem. It is from these positions that the Soviet Government urges all members of the United Nations to approach the consideration of the disarmament problem, the most burning and pressing problem of today.

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV

Chairman of the USSR Council
of Ministers

September 23, 1960

September 23, 1960

Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament

Proposals of the Soviet Government submitted to the Fifteenth Session of the United Nations General Assembly by N. S. Khrushchev, Head of the USSR Delegation, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR

The Governments of the States participating in negotiations on disarmament, guided by the resolution on "General and complete disarmament" adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations at its fourteenth session on 20 November, 1959, in the interests of saving mankind from the threat of a new war, and in the interests of securing lasting and inviolable peace on earth, recognize the need to proceed forthwith to the practical accomplishment of the task of general and complete disarmament, and have to this end resolved to draw up a treaty on general and complete disarmament, which will include the following basic provisions:

I. General and complete disarmament entails:

- the disbanding of all armed forces of States and the prohibition of their re-establishment in any form whatsoever;
- the prohibition and destruction of all stockpiles, and the cessation of the manufacture of all kinds of armaments, including atomic, hydrogen, chemical, biological and other types of weapons of mass destruction;
- the destruction of all means of delivering weapons of mass destruction to their targets;
- the liquidation of all kinds of military bases, and the withdrawal and disbanding of all foreign troops stationed in the territory of any State;

—the abolition of any kind of military conscription for citizens;

—the termination of universal military training and the closure of all military education institutions;

—the abolition of war ministries, of general staffs and their local agencies, and of all other military and paramilitary establishments and organizations;

—the discontinuance of the appropriation of funds for military purposes whether from State budgets or from public organizations or private individuals.

When general and complete disarmament has been achieved, States will have at their disposal only strictly limited contingents of police (militia), the size of which will be agreed upon for each country and which will be equipped with light firearms, for maintaining internal order and ensuring the personal security of citizens.

II. General and complete disarmament shall be carried out by all States over one and the same strictly defined period of time to be agreed upon, the process of disarmament being carried out gradually, in three consecutive stages, bearing in mind that at no stage shall any State gain military advantages over other States as a result of the course of disarmament.

To consider the question of the adherence of other States to the agreement on general and complete disarmament a conference will be convened with all countries participating.

III. All disarmament measures, from beginning to end, will be carried out under strict and effective international control as follows:

a) Immediately after the signing of the treaty a preparatory commission will be set up, with the task of taking practical steps to establish an international organization for the control of general and complete disarmament.

b) The control organization will be set up within the framework of the United Nations the moment the treaty comes into force. It will comprise all States, Parties to the treaty whose representatives will meet periodically as a conference to consider

matters arising out of the implementation of effective control over disarmament. The conference will elect a Control Council, consisting of permanent and non-permanent members, which will have its own local organs. The Control Council will consist of representatives of socialist countries, of representatives of States now members of Western military and political alliances, and of representatives of neutral States. Except where otherwise especially agreed upon, decisions in the Control Council will be taken by a two-thirds' majority of votes on substantive matters and by a simple majority of votes on procedural matters.

c) The Control Council will be responsible for the practical administration of the control system, will draw up instructions, and will in good time analyze and process the reports rendered to it. States will submit to the Control Council information about their armed forces and armaments.

d) In all countries Parties to the agreements the control organization will have its own staff, recruited internationally with due regard for the principle of equitable geographical distribution, and in accordance with the provisions of the treaty. The control organization will distribute its inspectors over the territory of States in such a way as to enable them to start discharging their functions the moment States initiate the implementation of disarmament measures. Each Party to the treaty will undertake to give the inspection teams timely and unrestricted access within its territory to any place where disarmament measures subject to verification are being carried out or to any area in which on-the-spot inspection of such measures is to be made. To these ends, each Party to the treaty will, for the account of the control organization, make available to the staff of the control organization all means of transport needed for travel within its territory.

e) The staff of the control organization will enjoy in the territory of each party to the treaty such privileges and immunities as may be necessary for exercising independent and unrestricted control over the implementation of the disarmament treaty.

f) International inspection teams will include experts in the type of units to be disbanded and the types of weapons to be destroyed.

g) The inspectors will communicate with the Control Council through existing channels of communication, being given such privileges as will ensure the prompt delivery of reports and instructions.

h) All the expenses of the international control organization will be met by the States Parties to the treaty. The scale of contributions of States will be laid down in the text of the treaty on general and complete disarmament.

The control organization shall at each stage have powers in conformity with the scope and nature of disarmament measures involved.

The basic disarmament measures will be spread over the three stages of the programme of general and complete disarmament in the following way:

First Stage

1. All means of delivering nuclear weapons will be eliminated from the armed forces of States; their manufacture will be discontinued and they will be destroyed. Such means include:

—strategic and tactical rockets, pilotless aircraft of all types, and all military aircraft capable of delivering nuclear weapons;

—surface warships that can be used as vehicles for nuclear weapons;

—submarines of all classes and types;

—all artillery systems, as well as other means, that can be used as vehicles for atomic and hydrogen weapons.

2. The armed forces of all States will be reduced to fixed levels, those of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics being reduced to a maximum level of 1.7 million men. Conventional weapons and munitions thus released are to be destroyed, and military equipment either destroyed or used for peaceful purposes. Military expenditures of States will be reduced correspondingly.

3. All troops will be withdrawn from foreign territories to within their own national frontiers. Foreign military bases and depots of all kinds, both those released after the withdrawal of troops and those kept in reserve, will be eliminated.

4. From the very beginning of the first stage and until the final destruction of all means of delivering nuclear weapons, the placing into orbit or stationing in outer space of any special devices, the leaving of their territorial waters by warships and the flying beyond the limits of their national territory by military aircraft capable of carrying weapons of mass destruction, will be prohibited.

5. The launching of rockets will be carried out exclusively for scientific peaceful purposes and in accordance with predetermined and mutually agreed criteria, and will be accompanied by agreed measures of verification, including inspection at the rocket launching sites.

6. States having nuclear weapons at their disposal will undertake not to transfer such weapons, or to transmit information necessary for their manufacture, to States which do not possess them. At the same time, States not possessing nuclear weapons will undertake to refrain from manufacturing them.

7. States will reduce their military expenditures correspondingly.

8. The following control measures will be carried out during the first stage:

On-site international control will be established over the destruction of rocket weapons, military aircraft, surface warships, submarines and other means which can be used as vehicles for atomic and hydrogen weapons.

International inspection teams will be dispatched to places where military bases are situated and troops stationed on foreign territories, in order to supervise the elimination of the said bases and the withdrawal of military personnel and troops to within their own national territories; control will also be established at airfields and ports, to ensure that they are not used for military purposes. At the same time, rocket launching sites, with the exception of those maintained for scientific peaceful purposes, will be destroyed under the supervision of the international control organization.

The control organization will have the right to inspect without hindrance all enterprises, plants, factories and shipyards, previously engaged wholly or in part in the production of rockets,

aircraft, surface warships, submarines and any other means of delivering nuclear weapons, in order to prevent the organization of clandestine production of armaments which can be used as vehicles for atomic and hydrogen weapons. By agreement, permanent control teams may be established at some plants and installations.

There will be on-site international control over the disbanding of troops and the destruction of armaments.

The duties of inspectors will include:

Supervision of precise and punctual compliance with decisions on the disbanding of military formations and units, elimination and destruction of the material of conventional armaments, military equipment and munitions;

Reporting to the Control Council and to the Government of the host country.

The control organization will have unhindered access to documents pertaining to the budgetary allocations of States for military purposes, including all relevant decisions of legislative and executive bodies of States.

International inspection teams dispatched by the control organization will have the right to carry out a thorough examination of rocket devices to be launched for peaceful scientific purposes, and to be present at their launching.

9. In the first stage joint studies will be undertaken of the measures to be implemented in the second stage relating to the discontinuance of the manufacture of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and to the destruction of stockpiles of such weapons.

10. The first stage is to be completed within approximately 1-1.5 years. The international control organization will review the results of the carrying out of the first-stage measures with a view to reporting on them to the States Parties to the treaty as well as to the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Second Stage

1. There will be a complete prohibition of nuclear, chemical biological and other weapons of mass destruction, with the cessa-

tion of manufacture and the destruction of all stockpiles of such weapons.

2. Further reduction of armed forces and armaments will be carried out to the levels to be agreed. Military expenditures of States will be reduced correspondingly.

3. The following control measures will be carried out during the second stage:

Representatives of the control organizations will conduct the on-site inspection of the destruction of all existing stockpiles of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. The control organization will have the right to inspect all enterprises which extract raw materials for atomic production or which produce or use fissionable materials or atomic energy. By agreement, permanent control teams may be established at some plants and installations.

On-site international control over the disbanding of troops and the destruction of armaments will be continued.

4. In the second stage joint studies will be undertaken of the following measures to be implemented in the third stage:

a) measures to ensure observance of the treaty on general and complete disarmament after the implementation of all the measures provided for by that treaty;

b) measures to maintain peace and security in accordance with the United Nations Charter under conditions of general and complete disarmament.

5. As in the case of the transition from the first to the second stage, the international control organization will review the results of the carrying out of the second-stage measures with a view to reporting them to the States Parties to the treaty, as well as to the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Third Stage

1. The abolition of the armed forces of all States will be completed. States will have at their disposal only strictly limited contingents of police (militia), the size of which will be agreed upon for each country, and which will be equipped with light firearms, for maintaining internal order and ensuring the personal security of citizens.

2. All remaining types of conventional armaments and ammunition, whether held by the armed forces or in depots, will be destroyed, and military equipment will either be destroyed or be put to peaceful uses.

3. Military production at all factories will be terminated including the manufacture of conventional armaments, with the exception of strictly limited production of light firearms intended for the use of the contingents of police (militia) retained by States after the end of the programme of general and complete disarmament.

4. War ministries, general staffs and all military and paramilitary establishments and organizations will be abolished. All military courses for reservists will be terminated. In accordance with their respective constitutional procedures, States will enact legislation prohibiting the military training of young persons and abolishing military service in all its forms.

5. The appropriation of funds for military purposes in any form, whether from State bodies, from private individuals or from public organizations, will be discontinued. The funds released as a result of the achievement of general and complete disarmament will be used to reduce or to do away entirely with taxes on the public, to subsidize the national economy and to furnish economic and technical assistance to the underdeveloped countries.

6. At the third stage, the following additional control measures will be introduced:

The international control organization will send inspectors to verify on the spot the abolition of war ministries, general staffs and all military and paramilitary establishments and organizations, and the termination of military training and all other forms of military activity.

Control will be established over the discontinuance of the appropriation of funds for military purposes.

The control organization may, where necessary, institute a system of aerial inspection and aerial photography over the territory of States.

7. After the programme of general and complete disarmament has been carried out, the control organization will be kept

in being to maintain constant supervision over the implementation by States of the obligations they have assumed. The Control Council will have the right to send mobile inspection teams to any point or to any establishment in the territory of States.

States will provide the control organization with information about the points at which the contingents of police (militia) are stationed, about their strength at every such point (area) and about any movements of substantial contingents of police (militia) near State frontiers. International inspection teams will carry out comprehensive control to ensure that the strength of the police (militia) and their armament are in conformity with the quota agreed upon for each country.

8. Other measures designed to ensure compliance with the treaty on complete disarmament will come into force.

9. Measures for preserving peace and security in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations will be put into effect. States will undertake, where necessary, to place at the disposal of the Security Council units from the contingents of the police (militia) remaining at their disposal.

As the implementation of the disarmament programme and the reduction of military expenditure of States proceeds, part of the funds thus released will be used to give economic assistance to underdeveloped countries.

September 23, 1960

Declaration on Granting Independence To Colonial Countries and Peoples

*Submitted by the Head of the USSR Delegation
N. S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the USSR Council of
Ministers, for consideration by the Fifteenth Session
of the UN General Assembly*

The states that set up the United Nations Organization laid in the basis of its Charter the lofty and humane ideals of equality and self-determination of nations and peoples.

Born in the period of victorious completion of the Second World War the United Nations embodied the hopes that inequality and enslavement of some nations and peoples by others would disappear along with the barbarity and cruelty of fascism and militarism. But not all the hopes of the peoples came true. Still unsolved is such a vital problem of our time as complete deliverance of mankind from the shameful colonial order inherited from the past.

Ours is the era of swift renovation of society, the era of establishing more progressive and just forms of life, of the upsurge of unprecedented triumph of man over the forces of nature. The time has come for complete and final liberation of peoples languishing in colonial bondage. Therefore the member states of the United Nations solemnly declare their convictions, intentions and demands for granting independence to colonial countries and peoples.

The peoples that oppress other peoples cannot be free. Each free nation should help in winning freedom and independence for the peoples that are still oppressed.

Great Revival of Enslaved Nations

Rapid liberation and emancipation of countries and peoples is a significant event of our time. Even during the lifetime of

the present generation two thirds of the world's population were living under conditions of colonial rule. At the end of the First World War the chains of colonial subjugation and oppression of nations were broken in a number of countries. The banner of national independence raised high over the world has become now the banner of hundreds and hundreds of millions of people in all continents of the globe. The time has come for the liberation and revival of nations, peoples and tribes which were but recently oppressed and downtrodden. Tens of new states have joined the family of independent countries. The democratic ideas of equality and self-determination of nations are being translated into reality.

The myth of inability of colonial peoples to rule and to create material values is reduced to ashes.

No one can say now that the peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America cannot govern themselves. Gigantic forces awoke for the construction of a new independent life, and their spirits rose. Now the solution of international matters is inconceivable without the participation of People's China, without the participation of the liberated peoples of India, Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon, the United Arab Republic, Iraq, Ghana, Guinea and other states, big and small.

Today no one can say that the liberation of nations and peoples that were under the yoke of colonialism in the past will bring about the extension of the zone of conflicts and clashes between countries. On the contrary, national liberation has led to the extension of the zone of peace while the colonial oppression and colonial policy have led and will lead to wars.

Today no one can assert that the liberation of nations would lead to the depression of economy, trade, crafts or agriculture. On the contrary, experience shows that it is the political liberation of colonial nations and the establishment of new independent states that open the way for a genuine upsurge of the national economy.

Now no one will dare to assert that the liberation of nations from the colonial yoke would lead to a decline of culture. Life shows that immediately after the liberation follows the revival, uplift and flourishing of original national cultures, expansion

of public education, improvement of health service, training of skilled national cadres: the possibilities of enriching world culture are rising.

Not only the peoples of the East are gaining from the liberation of previously oppressed nations but the peoples of the West as well. The cause of freedom of peoples, their equal relations, the preservation of peace in the world is being placed on a more solid foundation.

But the liquidation of colonial regimes is yet to be completed.

The member states of the United Nations cannot remain indifferent when over one hundred million people still languish in colonial subjugation in the ancient lands of Africa and Asia, on the islands of Oceania, on the islands of the Caribbean and in other places. The peoples of these countries have the right to national independence but nevertheless they are still deprived of rights, remain in the stocks. Violence and lawlessness continue to reign in these countries, the major law there being profit for foreigners whose interest is all; the inherent rights of man and peoples are nothing. The bossing by foreign administrators who despise and loot local populations; persecution of tribes, derision of national customs, inequality for indigenous populations, shameful disregard of their vital interests, degrading of national and human dignity give rise to deep indignation in every honest person.

The lash of the overseer swishes there, the hatchet of the executioner cuts heads off.

The peoples of the colonies do not want to live in slave conditions, they are fighting for their rights and independence, for everything that other nations enjoy. However, selfish interests of the imperialist circles in the West stand in their way and hinder the realization of the just aspirations of peoples. Colonial wars, punitive expeditions, open looting of peoples by monopolies, military tribunals and secret trials, reservations, color bar, prisons and concentration camps—these are some methods with which overt and covert colonialists try to strangle all independent and nationalistic life in colonial countries.

The Conference of African Nations in Accra justly branded all this as colonial fascism.

Those who stand for the preservation of the old colonial

rule still hope for severe measures of retribution in the colonies. Of course, such measures are hampering liberation. But does not life follow its course? Did the cruel reprisals carried out throughout decades stop the liberation of Indonesia? Did the massacre of tens and hundreds of thousands of people of Indo-China save the colonial rule there? Could the crimes committed now against the peoples of Africa stop the irresistible process of the liberation of African nations?

No forces of oppression and despotism can save a colonial order that has lived its life. And about those that were killed on the path to freedom one cannot say that they are dead, no, they are alive in the memory of peoples, they will live eternally as heroes of national liberation struggle.

Colonialism is in its agony. But in the last minute of its life it can bring about many sufferings and victims, ruin many lives in colonies and metropolises, destroy much wealth created by the labor of many generations.

The United Nations appeals to all peoples on earth and to all governments not to remain indifferent observers of the suffering of colonial peoples. Can one turn a deaf ear to the moans of the people of Kenya where for eight years the colonial authorities have continued to exterminate the local population driven into reservations, prisons and concentration camps, to the sufferings of the people of the Oman against whom aggressive war is being waged? Who can remain calm seeing unending carnage of the population of Nyasaland, Angola, Mozambique, Rhodesia, Runda-Urundi, South West Africa, Tanganyika, Uganda?

It is an intolerable situation in our time, in an age of progress and outstanding discoveries of scientific genius, boundless expansion of the power of man over the forces of nature, for France to wage colonial war in Algeria with the use of aviation, artillery, tanks and napalm bombs and other means of mass extermination against the Algerians who have been for nearly six years fighting with selfless courage for the freedom and independence of their motherland. Hundreds of thousands of Algerians have been killed, many Algerian towns and villages burned down and destroyed, a fifth of the country's population driven to concentration camps. Dying for this unjust cause are many sons of France.

Can such a situation be tolerated any longer? No, it cannot, if the interests of the great cause of peace, the interests of humanity and progress are to be cherished.

In what name do those who do not want to part with the colonial rule wage murderous wars against the peoples? Why are the freedom-loving aspirations of the enslaved peoples suppressed? Sometimes it is said that this is done in the interests of "civilization" of the less developed countries in order to prepare them for self-government.

But this is a lie given the shape of truth.

What civilization has been brought as a result of five centuries of the tyrannic colonial rule to the African countries of Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea whose area is more than half of Western Europe and who have a population of eleven million people? They have brought misery and lawlessness, forceful deprivation of the lands which have been watered with sweat of many a generation, expulsion of farmers into barren and drought-ridden regions.

Arbitrary rule, famine, ignorance and disease rage there, slavery and forced labor are actually in existence there. There is not a single establishment of higher education; secondary education is almost completely lacking.

Why can Portugal exercise such lawlessness in the colonies in our time? On what grounds?

During half a century of Belgian colonial domination the Congo's population decreased more than twice from punitive expeditions, starvation and disease. At the moment of the proclamation of the independence of the Republic of the Congo only few of its citizens could read and write.

The situation in other African colonies is no better in any way.

Of course, in some regions of the colonies roads, airfields, ports, mines, a few schools have been built. But all this serves the purposes of exploitation of the native population and of looting the natural wealth of the colonies.

The assertion that the colonial rule is necessary in order to prevent strife, fratricidal wars of tribes and peoples in colonies is a deliberate lie also. Developments in the Congo show that

colonialism thrives on the use of discord and the artificial rousing of differences between tribes and peoples. It tries to weaken their common struggle for liberation. The motto of the colonialists is, as ever, "divide and rule!"

What is inscribed on the colors of the peoples of Asia and Africa who are fighting for their national freedom and independence? Inscribed on them are the slogans of peace and unity of Bandung and Accra.

Being indifferent to the voice of justice, the colonialists are trying to preserve the arbitrarily drawn frontiers parting peoples and tribes as well as economic regions in Africa gravitating to each other, to disrupt the unity and the territorial integrity of many countries.

Independence for Colonial Countries and Peoples Is the Call of the Time

The United Nations appeals to peoples and governments irrespective of where their motherland may be—in the East or West, in the North or South—to raise the question prompted today by life itself: does a completely decayed colonial rule meet the ideals of the peoples and the possibilities of the present age?

One has only to compare the development for the past century of the independent countries of Europe or North America and the development of colonial countries in Africa to see clearly that the path of colonialism is the path of regression, the path of slow dying, destruction and degradation of the forcefully enslaved countries.

At a time when industry, transport, agriculture, science and culture have reached a high level in the economically developed countries, when vessels propelled by atomic energy have appeared, and artificial celestial bodies have been launched into the cosmos, Africa, the land of fantastic riches, has been retarded and turned into a continent of famine; the main implements of its agriculture, as thousands of years ago, are mattock, wooden plough and sharpened stakes; the primitive system of agriculture prevails which results in exhaustion and erosion of the soil. 🌱

Indeed, an abyss gapes now between the independent states with highly developed industries and the colonial countries, while

once Asia and Africa were the cradles of great civilizations which enriched the culture and civilization of other peoples.

It is obvious that the main purpose of the colonial regime is to gain enormous profits for big foreign monopolies which have seized the key economic positions in colonies, the extortion by all ways and means of wealth and material values. Therefore, the entire economy of the colonies is that of exploitation. Having been subjugated first of all to the narrow interests and needs of the markets of different, industrially more developed countries, it is advancing slowly in a deformed, one-sided direction.

Only after Ghana had been liberated was it recognized that its future lies not in the production of cocoa alone but in the development of modern industry with the extensive utilization of its large resources of hydro-electric power and the enormous deposits of bauxite and it is exactly this that is valuable from the point of view of the world's economy.

Under the colonial regime no use could have been made also of enormous hydro-power resources of the Republic of the Congo, which by their capacity nearly equal the present output of electric power in all the countries of Western Europe, taken together. The utilization of these resources alone would not only make it possible to start the development of its colossal mineral wealth in full measure and raise the level of agriculture in the Republic of the Congo but would transform, in a significant measure, the whole of the economic outlook of the Central African countries and raise the well-being of its population.

It is scientifically proved that all countries of the African continent as well as of other continents possess colossal and diversified natural resources that to a great extent are not exploited as yet. They could be brought to the service of the peoples of these countries and thus to the service of the whole of mankind. But the colonial regime deliberately preserves the economic backwardness of the colonies, hinders their industrialization and the sensible utilization of their resources. This is connected with an unprecedented waste of public funds, immense losses of labor, domination of the parasitic monocultural way of running the economy of the colonial countries which is adapted to satisfy the selfish interests of the metropolises.

The present level of science and technology, the latest achievements of science, agriculture and culture makes it possible, in a comparatively short period, for the peoples to use this huge wealth. However, in order to use it, it is first of all necessary to secure for the peoples the right to exist independently, to eliminate colonial rule, to render economic aid in using this wealth. This will permit a rise in the standards of living of the native population, expansion of internal markets, doing away with present illiteracy, with lack of national cadres, with the domination of monoculture in the colonial economy. The colonial forms are incompatible with the solution of tasks of this kind as well as with the great achievements of technology which are an inalienable part of modern civilization.

The gains from the exploitation of colonies go not to the peoples but mainly to big foreign monopolies—billionaires. Peoples of both the East and the West have to pay a high levy to colonialism. Oil and coffee, rubber and cotton, copper and bananas, various raw materials and foodstuffs brought from colonies are sold at a price scores of times as high as the price paid on the spot. Monopolies are robbing people twice—in the East when they buy and in the West when they sell colonial goods and raw materials.

Moreover, they compel peoples of the colonies to keep foreign troops and administration in peace time, that is to pay the price of the chains they are put into. At the same time the monopolies are charging taxpayers in metropolises higher taxes for carrying out punitive expeditions and colonial wars, forcing the peoples of the metropolises as well to pay for the shackles into which the monopolists-colonialists put other peoples. In fact, they are burying on the fields of devastation the freedom of their own people together with the independence of other nations. Such a situation is in itself a heavy indictment of the colonial system.

Meanwhile if the member states of the United Nations and first of all those of them, naturally, which in their time imposed the yoke of colonialism on many peoples, would show at least a minimum appreciation of the immediate needs of these peoples, they would find ways of meeting these needs. One of the main sources is the solution of the disarmament problem and curtailment of military expenditures of states.

It is known that the member states of the military and colonial North Atlantic bloc alone spend on the arms race 62 billion dollars a year. If at least half of this sum that is annually spent for unproductive purposes dangerous for peace were used for the development and uplift of African countries, for example, gigantic engineering and technical projects including the Ingui, Concure, Zanzibar and Volta plans—that is the plans for the construction of large hydroelectric power stations and irrigation systems, industrial enterprises and agriculture development schemes—then the liberated nations of Africa could build everywhere schools, universities, hospitals, roads and carry out other measures which would enable them to raise agriculture to a higher modern level.

At the same time if the bonds of colonialism were removed from African and other colonies this would facilitate the exploitation of their natural resources, increase the demand for European and American machinery and other industrial goods, increase the export of raw materials for the industry of Europe and America, raise the employment of the population and the utilization of industrial capacities, and ensure the raising of living standard of the peoples of industrially developed countries.

Every honest person and every government if it really stands for the equality of nations, for the realization of the great aims and principles proclaimed in the United Nations Charter cannot but see that colonialism is an obsolete and shameful phenomenon in the life of modern society. The complete and final liquidation of colonialism would be a prelude not only to social progress but also to rapid technical progress in industry and agriculture just as the end of the slave trade gave a powerful impetus to the development of the productive forces of society.

The liquidation of colonialism would be one of the most important measures to reduce international tension. It is the desire to prevent the liberation and the national development of young states in Asia, Africa, and Latin America that led to such armed conflicts and wars after the Second World War as those in Indonesia, Indo-China, Algeria, the aggression against Egypt, the foreign intervention in Lebanon and Jordan, the conspiracies against Syria, Iraq and others. And, indeed, all through the last hundred years most wars and armed conflicts were in one way or another

connected with colonialism, with the struggle of big powers for distribution and redistribution of colonies.

The peoples have more than once experienced the grave danger of colonial wars growing into a new world war. And now the intervention against the Republic of the Congo has led to an aggravation in the international situation, has endangered peace in Africa and, indeed, not only in Africa. Can one forget that in the present conditions with nuclear and rocket weapons in existence the conflagration of war started on one continent can instantly embrace the whole globe?

Many of the most important points of concentration of international tension — in the Middle and the Far East, in Africa and Latin America — are to a considerable degree a result of the colonial policy. Colonies and other so-called “non-self-governing territories” are often used as military bases of foreign powers, as firing grounds for atomic tests. Can such a situation make people feel secure, relieve them of the fear of war, show a way out of poverty, famine and disease which are still the lot of the peoples of the countries which remain colonies and trusteeship territories?

Apart from large colonies and trusteeship territories some powers retain as well strong points in different areas of the world, for example, Western Irian, Okinawa, Goa, Puerto Rico and others, not to mention Taiwan against which the USA has committed aggression, having occupied this territory of the Chinese People's Republic. Why do the highly developed industrial powers need such bases and “possessions” on foreign territories? Is it not an obvious survival of the epoch of former colonial domination? What would the Europeans or the Americans say if one or another Asian or African country demanded for itself strong points in the countries of Western Europe or North America?

There cannot be two opinions — these bases are kept to threaten the national independence and security of peoples in the neighbouring areas. As the trading stations at the dawn of colonialism served as a basis for the spread of colonial rule of oppression in Africa, Asia and America, so now, at the time of the decay of colonialism the imperialists are trying to use the remaining bases and colonies for brutal pressure on independent states of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The Shameful Colonial System Should Be Buried

The member states of the United Nations Organization submitting this Declaration, are of the opinion that every government which in deeds, and not in words is for peace and progress should respect the lawful rights of all nations without exception in their demands for equality, justice and independence. Either these demands will be recognized by all the states or the oppressed peoples with the support of their numerous friends in the world will take their destiny in their own hands and will gain liberty and independence, crushing all the artificial barriers erected in their way by the colonialists. The primary duty of all the nations is to extend a helping hand in the sacred struggle for independence against the yoke of the colonialists.

Together with the infamous system of colonialism such a form of colonial rule as the trusteeship system has also outlived itself. Being an obvious remnant of the mandate system of the League of Nations the present trusteeship system in accordance with the United Nations Charter should have facilitated the development of the trusteeship territories toward self-government and independence. Fifteen years have elapsed however since the Charter was adopted, but only four out of eleven trusteeship territories have attained independence.

So far no exact dates have been fixed for granting independence to the trusteeship territories including the largest of them — Tanganyika, Ruanda-Urundi, New Guinea.

The powers responsible for “trusteeship,” disregarding the principles of the United Nations, are preserving in fact colonial regimes, mercilessly exploiting the population and plundering national resources, repressing those who appealed to the United Nations Organization, hampering the economic and political development of the trusteeship territories.

The trusteeship system has not justified itself anywhere and should be buried together with the entire colonial system which is an anachronism. The regime of colonial oppression has left to man a heavy legacy in the form of numerous complicated problems. The tragic events in the Congo as well as in some other parts of the world where peoples are waging the just struggle for their rights, demand a reasonable solution of the problem

of relations between the indigenous population and the settlers who came from other continents. Racial discrimination in all its odious forms, i.e. division of peoples and nations into the privileged and the "inferior" is racism, justification of criminal genocide, the way of adding new evil deeds to the evil deeds committed earlier, of new crimes to the crimes committed earlier, the way of fomenting mutual hatred, endless bloody conflicts between countries and peoples.

Different people have different skin color, but the blood they have is of the same color. And not a single people can lay a claim to domination over other peoples.

Ties and relations between the peoples created at the time of colonialism should be replaced by new relations based on the principles of equality, friendship and mutual respect, irrespective of the social and political system of states, ideology and political views of people or the color of their skin. The peoples in colonies should get real independence, but not a fictitious one under which they would, in fact, be kept within the bounds of a modified colonial regime. They are demanding not only greater freedom within the colonial rule but the final elimination of this system, freedom for progress, the right to be their own masters, to make use of their wealth and the fruits of their labor. Every form of enslavement, every manifestation of "trusteeship" or "charity" toward peoples is a deep insult to their dignity.

Life itself makes it imperative to choose between stagnation and progress, between slavery and freedom, between the division of the peoples and their unity, between war and peace.

The United Nations considers it a duty to urge the powers that have colonial possessions to enter into negotiations on equal footing with representatives of the peoples of the colonies and reach agreement on the establishment of freedom and independence of the colonial countries.

Exact and early dates for negotiations should be fixed and any possibility of coercion or aggression on the part of the colonial powers should be ruled out. But should those powers turn a deaf ear to such an appeal, should they delay the liberation of the colonies, suppress the liberation movement of the colonial peoples, the peaceloving peoples should render every assist-

ance, moral and material, to the peoples fighting for their independence.

The member states of the United Nations proceed from the premise that every country, every nation has a full and inalienable right to independent existence. They feel confident that the elimination of the colonial regime will not mean alienation of the countries of Africa or Europe from one another. On the contrary, it will promote still greater cooperation among them. Such unity and cooperation, however, should be granted reciprocally and of free will.

The more consistently and directly the great principles of international cooperation are realized—the principles of equality, sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, mutual benefit, peaceful co-existence and economic cooperation, the better will be mutual understanding and agreement among free and equal states of the world.

Only thus will the countries of the West and the East, the North and the South march forward to progress, to genuine peaceful comity of nations utilizing the great achievements of modern science and culture. Only thus can be translated into reality the high principles of the right of nations and peoples to self-determination enunciated in the United Nations Charter.

Moved by the ardent desire for the earliest establishment of mutual good will and agreement among states and peoples as well as between the indigenous population of the non-self-governing territories and those who settled on such territories and wish to live there enjoying the same rights as those of the nationals of such countries, member states of the United Nations who affixed their signatures to this Declaration appeal to all people irrespective of language and race, religion and political outlook:

Let all the people of the globe hear our words!

We all live on one planet. On this planet we are born, we work, raise our children and pass on to them all we have achieved in life. And though there exist different states on earth, every person is born an equal citizen.

The very course of historic development at present poses the question of complete and final elimination of colonial rule in

all its forms and manifestations, and not some time in the distant future either, but immediately and unconditionally!

In accordance with this, member states of the United Nations solemnly demand:

1. *To grant immediately to all colonial countries, trusteeship territories and other non-self-governing territories complete independence and freedom in the building up of their own national states in conformity with the freely-expressed will and desire of their peoples. Colonial rule, colonial administration in all its forms should be abolished completely so as to make it possible for the peoples of such territories to determine their destiny and form of government.*

2. *To eliminate likewise all strongholds of colonialism in the shape of possessions and leasehold areas on the territories of other states.*

3. *The governments of all countries are called upon to observe strictly and consistently the provisions of the United Nations Charter and of this Declaration relating to equality and respect for sovereign rights and territorial integrity of all states without exception, allowing no manifestations of colonialism, no exclusive rights or advantages for some states to the prejudice of other states.*

* * *

In keeping with the noble principles of the Charter of this Organization member states of the United Nations cannot but regard the elimination of colonial rule as a most important stage in international life. This act in itself will prove a vital foundation for the development of genuine friendly relations among all states and among all peoples and thereby for the realization of the great objective of securing a durable and lasting peace on earth.

The sacred duty of each State and each government is to promote an early and full implementation of this Declaration.

September 23, 1960

An American Antique Dealer Presents Khrushchev with a Peace Pipe

Upon Khrushchev's return to his residence after his speech at the UN General Assembly, he was told that an American visitor and his wife wished to see him to present him with a peace pipe.

"All right," said Khrushchev, "let them come along. I shall be pleased to see them."

The Premier's American guests were Mr. and Mrs. Watson Pierce. The tall, gray-haired scholar carried in his hands an unusual 200-year-old Indian peace pipe.

In presenting the pipe to the Premier, Mr. Pierce said:

"I am presenting this peace pipe to the Premier of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics. My colleagues at Archaeological Artifacts and Antiques and I look upon this pipe as a symbol which the Indians of the Black Foot tribe used to mark an end to tomahawks and wars on the great plains of America. Our ancestors thought that they belonged to different nations. They fought, were frightened, and again fought until they found that they could expel the spirit of sorrow by quietly chatting as they sat round the campfire. The pipe was then passed from hand to hand. Smoke curled. And they became blood brothers and good neighbors in the human community.

"May A- and H-bombs and other weapons no longer frighten the men, women, and children of the world. When they talk, may the leaders of our two great powers, the USSR and the USA, see in this pipe a new age for the recently recognized African nations and for all other countries assuming the full responsibility for the establishment of a fair and desirable peace.

"Mr. Prime Minister, now this pipe is yours. And may you and the heads of other states symbolically smoke it together."

Accepting the pipe, Khrushchev thanked Mr. and Mrs. Pierce.

"May I tender my heartfelt thanks to you and your wife for this symbolic souvenir, for this present. Let me assure you that we have no ideal more lofty than the preservation of peace between peoples in the name of human happiness. The political and social organization of society is every state's own affair. We Soviet people believe that our social and political system is the most progressive and best of all. Many do not agree with us. That's their affair. Let them live as they like. We are sure that as time passes they will see the advantages of the new system for themselves. I was very happy to see you and accept this present. When I drive through the streets of New York I see many friendly faces. I am aware that the absolute majority of Americans realize the aim of my visit, which has been made in the interests of preserving world peace.

"Still there are a few who follow wolfish rules, so to speak, and howl when I drive through the city. I must confess to you that at home I allow myself the pleasure now and then of going out hunting and that is why I am familiar with the howling of wolves. What I want to say is that despite this howling there are many good-hearted people in America.

"You and your wife are such Americans. You very well know how restorers work when they restore old paintings. They take off the accumulations of time, layer after layer, and get down to the genuine article. By your visit and symbolic gift you, like all men and women of good will, are showing that you profoundly believe in good relations between people, in the relations which should exist between the peoples of America and the Soviet Union."

"My wife and I," said Mr. Pierce, "have lived in many countries and we know that there are men and women of good will everywhere. As you so rightly noted in your speech today, war was a calamity in the past and would be a still greater calamity today. With A-bombs, a war cannot be limited, and I believe that it may menace the whole of civilization."

"I agree," Khrushchev remarked. "I am pleased to see that we are of one mind as to the grave danger that an atomic war represents."

The American scholar then said that he wanted to go to the Soviet Union and that he hoped he would be given assistance in

visiting museums and other institutions. He said he hoped this assistance would help him to get over some bureaucratic obstacles.

"When you come to see us," said Khrushchev, "you will see that we are a hospitable people and that your notion of bureaucratic obstacles is all wrong. The doors of our museums are wide open to guests. If I don't happen to be away when you come to Moscow and if you would like to see me, I will be happy to see you at the Kremlin."

Mr. Pierce said that his wife was a writer.

Turning to Mrs. Pierce, Khrushchev remarked, "Visit us and perhaps you too, as a writer, will find some interesting things to write about. We are not asking you to praise us. Just tell the truth and we shall be grateful."

September 24, 1960

News Conference at Glen Cove

Premier Khrushchev spent the week-end of September 24-25, 1960 at the country house of the Soviet UN Mission in Glen Cove, Long Island. Spending the week-end with him there were N. V. Podgorny, head of the Ukrainian delegation, Kirill T. Mazurov, head of the Byelorussian delegation, President Antonin Novotny of Czechoslovakia, Todor Zhivkov, head of the Bulgarian delegation and Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, head of the Roumanian delegation together with members of their staffs. Representatives of the Hungarian and Albanian delegations had also been invited, but due to State Department restrictions, could not leave Manhattan.

Wladyslaw Gomulka of Poland and members of his delegation joined the group on Sunday.

On Saturday afternoon, President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic arrived in Glen Cove for a conference with Premier Khrushchev. In the evening, a press conference was held with newsmen.

QUESTION: Please describe your talk with Nasser.

KHRUSHCHEV: During the talk we exchanged views on general questions. We mainly talked of disarmament and the effort for a

stronger peace. President Nasser and I are old acquaintances and we maintain good personal relations.

QUESTION: Do you think your talk with Nasser was fruitful?

KHRUSHCHEV: Yes, I do.

QUESTION: Do you plan to meet Tito?

KHRUSHCHEV: We didn't come to any definite agreement about it, but I think we will meet.

QUESTION: Why did you leave Manhattan for Glen Cove?

KHRUSHCHEV: There are no hares in Manhattan, whereas they are to be found here. I like them a lot.

QUESTION: General Speidel of West Germany declared in Washington recently that Western defenses should be moved eastward, to the Soviet frontiers. What can you say about that?

KHRUSHCHEV: Speidel didn't say anything new. He only repeated Hitler's mad ideas. Everybody knows what Hitler's lot was. And it will be the lot of all who try to follow in his footsteps, of all the Speidels.

QUESTION: British newspapers say that Macmillan is coming here to make peace between the Soviet Union and the USA. What do you think about that?

KHRUSHCHEV: To make peace, I think, is too strongly put. But we are prepared to accept Macmillan's help in improving Soviet-American relations.

QUESTION: Does Nasser agree with you on disarmament?

KHRUSHCHEV: I didn't ask him about it.

QUESTION: Did he tell you about any of his own proposals on disarmament?

KHRUSHCHEV: President Nasser will speak at the General Assembly himself and will express his views about the matter.

QUESTION: What can you say about the position of the Western powers on West German armaments?

KHRUSHCHEV: One of the main contradictions in the position of the Western powers is that they speak of disarmament or rather control over armament, and at the same time continue to arm themselves and to give weapons to the most aggressive state, that is, West Germany.

QUESTION: What can you say about your stay here, in the heart of capitalism, so to speak?

KHRUSHCHEV: This is the heart of capitalism and I have the heart of a Communist. Evidently, we can coexist on one planet. For instance, in the capitalist world it often happens that an old but rich widow marries a young man. And they live together, though he evidently doesn't thirst so for the old woman's love. Still he lives with her. (*Laughter.*) In the same way, capitalist and socialist states must coexist even though there is no love lost between them.

QUESTION: Please tell us whether Nasser told you what he thought about the speech you made in the UN yesterday? What was his comment?

KHRUSHCHEV: I would be showing disrespect for my guest if I asked him a question like that. That's why I didn't ask that.

QUESTION: But perhaps he said something of his own accord?

KHRUSHCHEV: You are a rather cunning American. You want to know what I talked about with the President during our conversation. Try the front door as all normal human beings do, not the back one. (*Laughter.*) I won't tell you anything about the questions we discussed anyhow.

QUESTION: You have a balcony on the third story here. You could give news conferences from it, like the one you gave in New York.

KHRUSHCHEV: There is no need for that here. You felt offended then that we were talking "on different levels." Now I can talk with you on the same level, on the ground. (*Laughter.*)

In our talk here today I would like to provide some additional explanations for the point of view I set forth at the General Assembly. In a statement to the press Mr. Herter said that I had allegedly declared war on the UN. All that I beg you to do, gentlemen of the press, is to be exact and not distort what I tell you.

I would like to tell you once again what I said about the need for changing the structure of the UN Secretariat. My speech was not directed against Mr. Hammarskjold in person. It is not a matter of his person, but the fact that he expresses the position only of that group of countries which is headed by the USA.

However, there are in the world countries with different social and political systems. You know that the USA represents the capitalist countries that belong to Western military blocs. Those are the aggressive imperialist states. Then there are also

socialist countries, as you know. These countries conduct a policy of peace.

There are countries that are neutral. The most typical of them are India, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, Burma and Afghanistan, as well as Austria, Finland, Sweden, and other countries.

Hence, the world is made up of states which are sharply divided into three groups. But the UN Secretary-General now reflects the position of the states belonging to the Western military blocs. For that reason, when he carries out a Security Council decision or a decision of the General Assembly he naturally carries it out in the interests of only one group of countries, to wit, the group he represents. This, of course, is done in detriment to the interests of the two other groups, the socialist and neutral groups.

Therefore, we maintain that this cannot go on any longer. We think that not the UN Secretary-General by himself, but a more representative, collective executive body, perhaps a Secretariat-General, consisting of three Secretaries, should carry out the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Were the group of states headed by the USA to nominate Mr. Hammarskjold to this UN executive body, we would have no objections because we know him as a representative of these states.

However, this Secretariat-General should also have representatives from the socialist and neutral countries. Then the Secretariat would take into consideration the interests of all three groups of states, when carrying out UN decisions.

This structure of the UN Secretariat would help also to solve the disarmament problem. Why? Because now, in point of fact, all have agreed that if we reach an agreement on disarmament we shall establish international armed forces which will be employed under UN command.

Suppose now that we have already agreed to disarm and to set up international armed forces. The question, then, is: who is going to command these forces?

Will it be Marshal Malinovsky? He is an experienced commander, and I know him very well. But you will immediately ask: why Malinovsky? This is a lawful question. The Americans will say that it would be better to appoint the present NATO commander, Norstad, to the post, though I personally think Marshal

Malinovsky is a better commander than Norstad. Then the neutral countries will ask: why is it only the great powers who are proposing their commanders? We also want our interests to be reflected, they will say. We also want our own commander, Marshal Amer, say.

I ask you, gentlemen: will we ever be able to agree on these candidates? I don't think so. You won't accept our candidate, and we won't accept yours, Norstad, while as for Speidel, I suppose you won't nominate him yourselves. (*Laughter.*) Nor would you agree, I suppose, to have Amer. That means that it will be, in general, impossible to reach agreement on the establishment of international armed forces. If the UN armed forces are used as they are now, if they are commanded by Hammarskjold alone, no good will come of it. The Congo provides an instance of that.

The Congo government asked the UN to help with armed forces. Armed forces were sent and began to operate against the lawful government which had asked for help. You know that these armed forces established control over the airfields, the radio station and communications and thus, far from helping, on the contrary, complicated the work of the lawful Lumumba government.

Incidentally, why do we support Lumumba? Because he is the Prime Minister of the lawful government appointed by the Parliament which the Congolese people elected. But why did the troops, sent in the name of the UN, start operating against the Lumumba government? Because it was profitable for the colonialist-imperialist powers. They want to remove the Lumumba government which is for preserving the country's independence and which seeks to govern its country in the interests of the Congolese people.

UN Secretary-General Hammarskjold is helping Tshombe. But that man is a traitor; he is betraying the interests of the Congolese people. Tshombe is what Petlura was during the revolution in our country. On behalf of the UN, Mr. Hammarskjold is supporting Colonel Mobutu in the Congo, a man who is also acting against the Congolese government. But Mobutu is a brigand. If we again were to look for a comparison with our country he would be akin to Wrangel, Kolchak, or other such flotsam of history which our people chucked out. To make a long story short, the forces operating against the lawful government, the lawful parliament and the Congolese people, are being supported by

Hammaraskjold on behalf of the UN. This means that in the Congo the UN Secretary-General is pursuing the policy of the Belgian colonialists and their sympathizer, the USA, and not the policy of the peace-loving socialist and neutral countries.

Or take this example. If we agree to disarm—and I believe that with time we will—and if we establish UN armed forces, these armed forces, given the UN in its present structure, may find themselves under the command of a person, for example, Mr. Hammaraskjold, who expresses only the interests of the West.

Therefore gentlemen, judge for yourselves, can we, the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist camp, agree in such a situation to disarmament and to the establishment of international armed forces which would operate under such a command? Of course not.

One can also understand the point of the USA and the countries affiliated with it in the military blocs. They would not trust us either, were the UN Secretary-General to be a representative of the socialist countries. So both sides should understand each other's mistrust of a one-man command of the UN Secretariat. The UN Secretariat-General should include not only a representative of the West and a representative of the socialist world, but also a representative of the neutral countries.

This should be done in order that the Secretariat approach in a more objective way the implementation of decisions with respect to questions of an international order, with the aim of ensuring peace on earth and good neighborly relations between countries.

As you can see we have nothing against Hammaraskjold personally. We are looking for a more perfect form of organization that would guarantee peaceful coexistence of all states with different political and social systems, so that the decisions the UN makes would not go against the interests of one or another UN member. That is our stand. It is not at all a belligerent position. On the contrary, it is a very peaceful one. And we are prepared to cooperate with Mr. Hammaraskjold as the representative of a definite group of countries, as long as there are along with him in the Secretariat representatives, with the same powers, from the socialist and neutral countries, so that they may jointly decide all matters.

We are not in favor of substituting our own candidate for Hammaraskjold. You cannot find a man for this post who would be three persons wrapped up in one, who would be able to represent all three groups of states at once. That just cannot be done. True, they say that God was three in one. But nobody has ever seen Him. So let Him remain in the imaginations of believers. What we want to have is a three-man UN Secretariat.

It is already dark. It is very hard to take things down. I am taking care of your eyesight, gentlemen of the press. You will find a use for it. (*Laughter.*) Let's end our talk.

September 25, 1960

News Conference at Glen Cove (II)

QUESTION: If the question of the Secretary-General is not decided as you suggest, will that mean the Soviet Union will discontinue disarmament talks?

KHRUSHCHEV: No, it won't.

QUESTION: In the light of your proposal regarding the UN Secretariat, how will you react to the formation of international armed forces under the aegis of the United Nations if your proposal is not accepted?

KHRUSHCHEV: Under such conditions we shall not agree to the creation of international armed forces. We do not want such forces to be under the sole command of the UN Secretary-General.

QUESTION: Do you intend to address this session once again?

KHRUSHCHEV: I intend to address it more than once, otherwise the travel expenses won't be covered. (*Animation.*)

QUESTION: What subjects will you take up?

KHRUSHCHEV: That's a secret.

QUESTION: It is rumored that Fidel Castro is going to speak for four hours. Will you have the patience to listen to him?

KHRUSHCHEV: I am ready to listen to Castro even for six hours. (*Animation.*)

QUESTION: Today the United States launched a satellite which is to be orbited around the moon.* What do you have to say about this?

*The correspondent referred to a 387-pound sphere launched atop an Atlas A-66 rocket which, it was later learned, failed to reach its destination. (*Ed.*)

KHRUSHCHEV: It is very good. If your satellite lands on the moon successfully, our lunik, which has been there for a long time already, will welcome it as its American mate. Let's hope that they will get on nicely, on the principles of peaceful coexistence, which we still lack here on earth.

QUESTION: An American general declared that two Soviet astronauts perished a few days ago. Is this true?

KHRUSHCHEV: It's one of those generals' jokes. *(Laughter.)*

QUESTION: Do you think that Hammarskjold should resign?

KHRUSHCHEV: Let him think it over and decide by himself.

QUESTION: You proposed, on condition that other countries find it expedient, that the UN headquarters be set up in Moscow. But you have censorship for foreign correspondents, there is no Western press on sale, and broadcasts are jammed.

KHRUSHCHEV: I have already said at the General Assembly, and I repeat now, that all conditions will be provided for the successful work of the representatives of various countries in the United Nations.

QUESTION: The US government considers that Hammarskjold's policy in the Congo was the best. What can you say on this score?

KHRUSHCHEV: This appraisal contradicts the facts. Of course, Hammarskjold suits you. Herter shakes his hand and solemnly hands over to him a check for five million dollars for rendering assistance to the Congo. In actual fact Hammarskjold's policy has been harmful to the legitimate government of the Congo. Had there been three Secretaries-General in the United Nations, as we propose, they would not have tolerated a situation where United Nations troops helped not the legitimate Congolese government, but those who opposed it. The country should be ruled by its legitimate government and not by United Nations troops.

Our times have seen many instances of people who were wrongly appraised. It is known, for example, that President Eisenhower considered Syngman Rhee to be a most clever man. Where is Syngman Rhee now? Where is he hiding?

QUESTION: If there were no UN troops in Korea, to whom would all Korea belong? To the North Koreans?

KHRUSHCHEV: To the Koreans, in any case. At the present time there are foreign troops in South Korea, and not in North Korea.

I want to say once again that one man in a post such as that of Secretary-General of the United Nations cannot satisfy the demands of all the groups of member states of the UN. When unilateral decisions are made, the other side is compelled to rely on its national forces. But we should not bring matters to conflicts, to wars. The policy of operating "from positions of strength," and of "rolling back communism" has suffered many fiascoes.

Remember Dulles, who initiated the policy of "rolling back communism." Regarding this policy Mr. Stevenson noted most wittily not long ago that the Democrats have been restraining communism in Europe while the Republicans are trying to restrict it in Manhattan.

Communism has taken firm root and has developed into a mighty tree, which is not afraid now of any storms and tempests.

QUESTION: Has this tree really taken such firm root?

KHRUSHCHEV: Try and shake it. There was an attempt to organize intervention after the October Revolution, but nothing came of it.

(At that moment shouts were heard from pickets standing a few yards away. Khrushchev remarked: "This is a manifestation of American 'culture' for you.")

QUESTION: Our newspapers printed the full text of your speech in the United Nations, whereas there were only 600 words about Eisenhower's speech in your newspapers. Where is freedom of information in this case?

KHRUSHCHEV: You don't know your own business. My speech was printed in full only in the *New York Times*, but without the supplements—the Declaration and our proposals on disarmament. As regards President Eisenhower's speech, the full text of it was printed in our newspaper *Izvestia*, whose circulation is several times bigger than that of the *New York Times*. Now you may judge of freedom of information.

QUESTION: When Raul Castro was in Moscow you declared that in the event of US intervention against Cuba the Soviet Union would strike at the United States. Have I interpreted your statement correctly?

KHRUSHCHEV: More or less correctly. But you have no reason to feel nervous. Your analyst, Lippmann, wrote: "Khrushchev said

'if.' But since America doesn't intend to attack Cuba, all danger has passed.

QUESTION: You say that one should not peek through other people's fences. Why have you been the first to put up a fence?

KHRUSHCHEV: What fence?

CORRESPONDENT: The Iron Curtain.

KHRUSHCHEV: Wake up, young man. Have you been in the Soviet Union? Oh, you haven't! And still you are trying to prove something. Incidentally, when a peasant plants a garden he fences it in lest the shoots should be spoiled by pigs.

Come to the Soviet Union, we shall give you a visa, and you will see that there is no Iron Curtain.

CORRESPONDENT: I feel all right here. I am quite happy.

KHRUSHCHEV: A slave also thinks he is happy having eaten leavings from his master's table. You are a slave of capitalism!

CORRESPONDENT: You too like to peek through other people's fences.

KHRUSHCHEV: Where is that?

CORRESPONDENT: In Hungary.

KHRUSHCHEV: It's all lies you are telling! At the request of the Hungarian Revolutionary Government the Soviet Union helped the Hungarian people to throw out traitors of the type of Colonel Mobutu in the Congo.

(Pickets were again heard shouting nearby. The Premier pointed in that direction.)

KHRUSHCHEV: What's that? They must be earning dollars for a dinner.

PRESIDENT WLADYSLAW GOMULKA of Poland remarked to correspondents:

"You must understand, we have not come as your guests, but to attend the United Nations Organization. But look at the way some Americans are treating delegations from different countries! It's a disgrace! I am sure that nothing like this would have happened in any other country."

(At that moment N. V. Podgorny and K. T. Mazurov drove up in their cars. Khrushchev said: "Here come reinforcements in the persons of representatives of 'enslaved' Ukraine and Byelorussia. Look how 'enslaved' they are!")

QUESTION: What is the purpose of your arrival at the United Nations?

KHRUSHCHEV: Above all, to achieve a decision on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in the interest of world peace.

September 26, 1960

Speech at Cyrus Eaton Luncheon

Cyrus Eaton, prominent American industrialist, gave a luncheon for Premier Khrushchev at the Hotel Biltmore. Attending were about two hundred businessmen and public figures from both the United States and Canada. Following is the Premier's speech at that luncheon which was also addressed by Senator Donald Cameron of Banff, Alberta, Canada and by Mr. Eaton himself.

ESTEEMED HOST, MY GOOD OLD FRIEND, MR. EATON,

ESTEEMED MRS. EATON,

ESTEEMED LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

It is a pleasure for me to be present at this luncheon and to meet the people I know, representatives of business and public circles of the United States and Canada. I have never been to Canada, but since the Canadians whom we see here have been invited by Mr. Eaton, I believe they share many of our honorable host's perfectly fair and wise ideas.

I avail myself of this opportunity as your guest to congratulate you from the bottom of my heart on the high award you recently received—the International Lenin Prize for the Promotion of Peace Among Nations. We greatly appreciate your activity in strengthening peace and are happy that you merited the great honor of receiving one of the highest distinctions which the public can confer upon outstanding leaders of various countries working for the sake of strengthening world peace. I am also proud of the fact that the public has bestowed upon me the title of Laureate of the International Lenin Prize for the Promotion of Peace. This is a great honor for any man no matter what social and political views he holds.

It is symbolic to a certain extent that you, one of the leading representatives of the capitalist world, and I, who hold no small place in the communist world, direct our common efforts toward the struggle for peace. This shows that given the desire and good will, people, despite differences in their views, can and must unite their efforts in the struggle for peace in order to safeguard peace among nations.

In reply to your cordial speech, Mr. Eaton, I would like first of all to wish you and your esteemed wife further success in your activities for the good of peace, and happiness in your personal lives.

Allow me to thank you, Mr. Eaton, for your kind invitation to visit the state of Ohio where you wanted to show me some iron and steel plants and your farm. I am sure I would have seen many interesting things there. I hope and believe that the time will come when I shall be able to avail myself of your invitation without being restricted in my movements around the United States.

You, Mr. Eaton, and I belong to the same generation; we have seen a lot in our lives. The entire history of the present day has practically passed before our very eyes and that is why, on the basis of life experience, we are able to judge it and draw definite conclusions. You and I hold different political, ideological and social views. And yet we have not lost the ability, after speaking together for a number of years, to understand one another reasonably, to argue, to differ on a number of questions, without declaring war on each other, without frowning when we meet.

Why is this so? Because the capitalist Eaton and the communist Khrushchev when talking and meeting retain their opinions, as you understand. Just as I have no intention of converting Mr. Eaton to the communist faith, so, I hope, Mr. Eaton would not waste his time trying to turn me into a supporter of the capitalist point of view. But the representatives of the capitalist and the socialist states have to learn to understand one another in order to settle questions between states by peaceful means, to prevent the outbreak of military conflicts and a new world war.

There are many examples of the peaceful competition of capitalist and socialist countries and their mutually advantageous cooperation. This is taking place because at the head of a number of capitalist states stand far-sighted political leaders who soberly

appraise the course of international events and take the world as it is. They understand that business-like, mutually advantageous relations must be established with the socialist countries.

I agree with you, Mr. Eaton, that we have opportunities to live in peace and successfully develop competition on a peaceful basis. And history will judge us and show which system is better.

Public figures, journalists and ordinary people frequently ask me why I came to New York in the autumn of 1960. I want to speak about this again, although I think I explained it sufficiently clearly in my speech at the United Nations General Assembly. The Soviet delegation came to New York to the United Nations Assembly in order to prove again and again the vital need for general and complete disarmament under international control. I repeat, under strict international control.

In order to evade the disarmament problem and to divert public opinion some Western leaders say that we demand disarmament without control.

The United States press alleges that in making the proposal on general disarmament I spoke hazily about control. I do not know how to disperse this haziness among those who have veiled their own eyes and their reason with this haze. Any sober-minded person can read quite clearly what I said about international control, and what is most important, we are prepared to sit down at the negotiation table and help to clarify the unclear questions. But before sitting down at the table and conducting negotiations we have to agree firmly that we must decide the question of disarmament, we must achieve agreement on disarmament under strict international control. We demand precisely disarmament under control and not control over armaments. For control over armaments does not diminish the danger of a sudden outbreak of war. Control over armaments is also fruitless from the economic standpoint since it does not lighten the burden of the arms drive that lies entirely on the shoulders of the peoples.

Mr. Eaton in his speech named the figure of 100 billion dollars annually spent on armaments. So what are we to do, double or treble this figure in a year or two, or in five years' time? Can we permit the colossal human values created by the efforts of millions upon millions of people to be spent unproductively or on the accumulation of weapons of mass extermination?

Sober-minded people, no matter who they may be, cannot regard as normal such a purposeless and dangerous squandering of values created by the effort of people. Was it not worth coming to New York to fight again for such a just and noble cause as the termination of the arms race, complete abolition of the disgraceful colonial system that humiliates the dignity of man? Was it not worth crossing the ocean to improve the activities of the United Nations Organization for the sake of strengthening peace? I think it was worth it!

The Soviet Government did not spare and will not spare either effort or time to achieve disarmament, so that the peoples may be freed from the fear of a third world war, from the burden of taxes used for preparing a new war.

We have submitted for the consideration of the Assembly other questions as well, the proper solution of which would help to normalize the international situation and lessen the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear war.

I would like to say a few words in passing about some hasty statements and reproaches made against me in connection with the proposal on reorganizing the United Nations Secretariat. It is said that Khrushchev is attacking Hammarskjold and is creating a crisis in the United Nations Organization.

I have already said that the chief thing is not the criticism of Mr. Hammarskjold as a person. The question at issue is not that he personally maintains the position of the US State Department in assessing international events but that this position of his affects the execution of United Nations decisions in favor of one group of states, to the detriment of other states.

Can a man who adheres to the point of view of but one definite side execute a decision of the United Nations Organization? If the candidacy of Mr. Hammarskjold suits the Western countries we shall not object if they nominate him to the corresponding post in the executive triumvirate which we propose should be set up, but in this body, besides Mr. Hammarskjold, there must be a representative from the socialist countries and a representative from the neutral countries. In this way the executive body of the United Nations would reflect the actual correlation of forces that has been historically established in the present-day world. It is also said that in this case, the Soviet Union would have two-thirds of the

United Nations executive power in its hands. They have in mind that the representative of the neutral countries would allegedly always support the position of the socialist countries, but in my opinion, this argument does not speak in favor of those who advance it. It only shows that the policy now pursued by the ruling circles of the Western countries is obviously not meeting with sympathy among the states adhering to neutrality.

Mr. Eaton said many reasonable things about the importance of improving relations between our two countries, about the successes achieved by the United States of America, and about the fact that we in the Soviet Union have achieved a high level of economic development. It is common knowledge that the American people have attained much in their country's development but we do not envy this. We propose to the United States of America peaceful competition in economic development and in improving the people's well-being. I agree that this competition can be more successful if trade is organized between the two countries. During my last visit to the United States I spoke much about the usefulness of such trade without discrimination.

Peaceful competition embraces the main economic indices and covers many other aspects of life. We should compete to see who produces more and cheaper steel, oil, grain and coal, who builds more dwellings, schools, scientific and cultural institutions so that the people may be better provided. We can also compete in baseball. We know that the Americans like this game very much. We have a game similar to this. It is called *lapta*. I played the game in my childhood. However, with age, and chiefly because of preoccupation with other things I had to give up playing *lapta*. Everything in its time.

We are proud that Soviet young men and women gained the upper hand at the Olympic Games in Rome, but we also paid tribute to the American sportsmen who scored outstanding results in the Olympiad.

You said, Mr. Eaton, that you like farming and are acquainted with it. I am pleased that you also appreciate my interest in agricultural production. I was born in the country and, although I have been living in town for a long time, I try to pay my native village a visit every summer during my holidays.

I love to visit the place of my birth. There, as everywhere else in our country, I see ever new changes for the better. The land is being better and more productively cultivated, our cities and villages are becoming more beautiful. And the most important thing is that people are living a better and more cultured life. They have every confidence in the morrow.

Competition between socialism and capitalism is determined not only by the absolute quantity of national production and not only by the quantity of per capita production. It is also determined by achievements in the formation of the personality so that man who creates all the values on earth may be the first of these values, so that he may advance science and technology more successfully, easing life on earth and making it more beautiful for all people.

You have asked me, Mr. Eaton, to see to it that the Soviet Government continues its tireless efforts in convincing the statesmen of the world to agree unconditionally to general and complete disarmament. As a statesman and as a man I can tell you that this is one of the primary purposes of my life, of the activities of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government.

We are pleased that these actions in defense of peace and for disarmament are meeting with wide support among people of different social and political views. If all the peoples direct their efforts towards achieving disarmament and bring pressure upon those governments that resist this, then the peoples will be able to achieve general and complete disarmament. The Soviet Government on its part will do everything possible to achieve such agreement on disarmament and thus ensure peace throughout the world.

Guided by reason and the experience of human history, all of us together must achieve disarmament and the world will then heave a sigh of relief.

There is criticism in the American press about our proposals on disarmament. Some American journalists write approximately as follows: Khrushchev has proposed a plan for disarmament but he speaks somewhat hazily about control.

I would like to address the representatives of the press if they are present here, and if they are not I would like my remarks to reach the press. Agreement should be reached in the first place on the main thing, on general and complete disarmament under strict international control. As for control, let us agree to this: you

suggest your formulations. I am sure we shall find a common language on questions of control, because if agreement is reached on general and complete disarmament there will be no cause for argument on questions of control over the fulfilment of the agreement on general and complete disarmament.

If we do not reach agreement on disarmament, but talk only about control, nothing will come of it. But if we reach agreement on disarmament, on the disbanding of armies and abolition of means of mass destruction, it will be easy simultaneously with this to reach agreement on control.

I repeat, we also agree to discuss any formulations on control for the sake of achieving agreement, for the sake of strengthening peace.

I would like to make the following suggestion to you. Our talks with the governments of the Western powers on disarmament do not seem to be making any headway so far. What if we try an experiment like this: let the business people of all countries—the United States, Britain, Canada, France, our country and other countries—journalists, lawyers and others—get together and help the governments to reach agreement on disarmament. I would gladly agree to present my views to these people if they invited me, and would listen to their considerations. The heads of the other governments would have to do likewise. I think this would be a very useful experiment which would facilitate the achievement of an agreement on disarmament. After all, the people both in the socialist and in the capitalist countries want to live in friendship, to develop their economy so that peace reigns on earth, so that the people will not be threatened with war.

Thank you, gentlemen, for your attention.

I propose a toast to the health of Mrs. Eaton, Mr. Cyrus Eaton, and all of you gentlemen. (*Applause.*)

At the conclusion of Khrushchev's speech, Cyrus Eaton said: "If you have no objections the representatives present at our meeting would like to ask you several questions."

KHRUSHCHEV: If you have any questions I am ready to answer them. Questions should not be evaded.

QUESTION: Can the USSR and Canada have contacts in the sale of similar commodities, ores in particular?

KHRUSHCHEV: You want to know whether the Soviet Union can have contacts with Canadian industrialists in the production and sale of similar commodities, such as ores, for example. I can answer briefly, it can.

We are cooperating, for example, in the international organization dealing with the sale of tin. There each country has a definite quota determined by a general agreement. Why not extend this principle to other commodities?

We are prepared to sign such an agreement. Shall we sign it now, or later? (*Laughter.*)

VOICES: Now!

KHRUSHCHEV: By all means, we are ready.

QUESTION: Do you, Mr. Prime Minister, think it possible that expenditures on arms could be considerably reduced by mutually beneficial, free trade between the United States, Canada and other countries and also the Soviet Union?

KHRUSHCHEV: Esteemed gentlemen! There is no greater happiness for the Soviet Government, for the Soviet people, than to reach agreement on the disarmament problem. For if we reached agreement on disarmament we would not only avert the threat of a new world war but would be able to increase manyfold peaceful production for the benefit of the peoples. That is why we are ready to cooperate with all states in this field.

I can tell you that when I met with the President of the United States last year we had frank talks. He told me once: military men often come to me and say—give us money for the production of some weapon or other. If you don't the Russians will outstrip us in armaments. (*Laughter.*) The President asked me: And how are things in your country? I answered: In our country approximately the same takes place. Military men and scientists approach the Government and ask for money for the production of new rockets. And we give them the money. Six months later the same people come and say: we have worked out more modern designs of rockets, give us money for these rockets. We tell them: but we have recently given you money for new rockets. And they answer: now we have produced more perfected rockets, give us money, otherwise the Americans will outstrip us. (*Laughter.*)

And we have to give money again. It is like the story about the locust that has no end. (*Laughter.*)

There are no limits to the arms drive. Let us stop this race to the abyss, let us stop the arms race, and the sooner the better. For this will be to the benefit of our countries, to the benefit of the peoples. (*Applause.*)

DR. HILL: Mr. Prime Minister! I am among those who welcome your efforts and support your proposals on general and complete disarmament. These proposals envisage the establishment of international inspection with posts in different countries. Since our countries possess vast territories, violations of the agreement are possible in remote areas of these countries. In this connection I would like to know your opinion on what your attitude will be should the population freely report to the international agency on a contemplated violation of the international agreement on disarmament?

KHRUSHCHEV: On behalf of the Soviet Government I solemnly declare that we welcome everything the scientist has stated here in the question he put, and I can put my signature to what he said. (*Prolonged applause.*)

At the conclusion of the meeting, Cyrus Eaton heartily thanked Premier Khrushchev for finding the time to meet with representatives of business and science from the United States and Canada.

Mr. Eaton expressed the hope that the Premier would continue with his former energy to uphold the great ideas of peaceful coexistence and disarmament directed towards strengthening world peace.

September 26, 1960

Letter to President of UN General Assembly

The Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers forwarded the following letter to the President of the UN General Assembly on disarmament and the situation that has come about with respect to the realization of Resolution No. 1378 on Disarmament which the General Assembly adopted at its Fourteenth Session on November 20, 1959:

Supplementing the statement of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of September 23 on disarmament, I have the honor to forward herewith a draft resolution on the question of the composition of the Disarmament Committee which

the delegation of the USSR is submitting to the Fifteenth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations for consideration.

Please circulate this letter as an official document of the General Assembly.

N. KHRUSHCHEV

Chairman of the Council of Ministers
of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Draft Resolution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

The General Assembly resolves that the number of participants in the Ten Nation Disarmament Committee be increased to include, besides the representatives of Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Italy, Poland, Roumania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America, the representatives of the following countries: India, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, Ghana and Mexico.

October 1, 1960

Concerning Representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations

Speech at the UN General Assembly

MR. PRESIDENT, FELLOW DELEGATES:

The delegation of the Soviet Union believes it necessary to submit for the consideration of the General Assembly the question of restoring the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

There is not the slightest doubt that the artificial barring of the People's Republic of China from participation in United Nations activities greatly harms our organization, considerably narrows the scope of its activities, hampers the consideration of international problems for the solution of which the collective efforts of all states are required, and renders the fruitful consideration of major problems virtually impossible.

I wish to emphasize particularly that the question concerns the restoration of the rights of a great power which, according to the UN Charter, is a founder and a member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council, but which so far has had no possibility of taking its legitimate place, participating in the work of the United Nations and making a contribution to its activities.

The situation is completely abnormal when the great Chinese people, comprising one-fourth of all mankind, has no representatives in the organization that is called upon to be the broadest international forum and is based on the principle of the universal representation of all the countries of the world.

States with diverse social systems and forms of government are represented in the United Nations, and it is here that a realistic image of the contemporary world should be reflected as in a mirror. Under the present state of affairs, however, when there are no representatives of China in the United Nations, a genuine image of the present-day world is not reflected in the United Nations. It is distorted beyond recognition.

It is clear to every man of common sense that the People's Republic of China is a great power that unites the whole Chinese people, and that the Government of the People's Republic of China exercises absolute state power over the entire territory of China, except for a few islands where the remnants of the Chiang Kai-shek clique routed by the Chinese people are still holding out temporarily under the protection of the American fleet.

The People's Republic of China has received wide international recognition and has established normal diplomatic relations with 34 states. The international ties of the People's Republic of China are rapidly expanding. The trade and cultural relations of People's China now embrace almost the entire world.

The Chinese people are engaged in a titanic effort to transform their country, which in the recent past was economically backward, into an advanced industrial socialist state. And they are vitally interested in keeping the peace and are in favor of peaceful international economic and cultural cooperation.

China was one of the sponsors of the five principles of peaceful coexistence in 1954. The Government of the People's Republic of China repeatedly submitted proposals aimed at lessening inter-

national tension in the Far East as well as in the whole world. The People's Republic of China made a large contribution to the peaceful settlement in Indochina, Korea and other areas of the Asian continent. The Government of China actively favors the creation of a zone of peace in Asia as well as a zone free from atomic weapons in the Pacific. It proposes a peaceful nonaggression treaty among all countries of Asia and the Pacific, including the United States.

Chou En-lai, the Premier of the Council of State of the People's Republic of China, speaking in Peking on August 1, 1960, re-emphasized that the Government of the People's Republic of China adheres to the policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. He said, and I quote: "We want peaceful coexistence not only with Asian and Arab countries but with European countries and countries of other areas of the world as well." "We are in favor," he continued, "of a peaceful nonaggression pact among the Asian countries and the countries of the Pacific, including the USA, so that this entire area may become a zone free from nuclear weapons."

The policy of the Government of China attests convincingly to the fact that it firmly adheres to the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence and that it supports the main objectives and principles of the United Nations by its practical actions, exerts great efforts to widen international cooperation and to strengthen peace and friendship among nations.

Then why has the United Nations still been unable to solve the important and absolutely clear question of the representation of People's China? Mainly because the United States of America does not want this. It does its utmost to prevent the People's Republic of China from taking its legitimate place in the United Nations.

At this session of the UN General Assembly many heads of state and government have in all clarity spoken about the absolutely intolerable situation that has taken shape as a result of the great People's China not being represented in the United Nations.

The Government of the United States pursues a hostile and aggressive policy against People's China. The United States, having committed an act of aggression against China as far back as in

1950, forcibly captured the island of Taiwan and continues to use it as a base for carrying out warlike provocations against the People's Republic of China, continues to build up the so-called "deterrent forces" in the Far East and to spend billions of dollars for assistance to the Chiang Kai-shekists and for the preparation of new war provocations.

The United States has set up numerous military bases along the Chinese frontiers. In the past eighteen months it has undertaken more than forty major military maneuvers in the Far East area, of which almost half were in Taiwan and the Taiwan Straits. The American generals make no secret of the fact that these maneuvers were spearheaded against the People's Republic of China.

And at the same time highly placed American political leaders hypocritically talk of the "aggressive nature" of the People's Republic of China. They constantly harp on the illegal resolution proclaiming China an "aggressor" which the United States in the past has foisted upon the General Assembly. Incidentally, it would be appropriate in connection with the above-mentioned resolution to inquire whose troops are at present stationed in Korea. If the State Department has a short memory, it can be recalled that Chinese volunteers have long since left that country, while American troops continue to occupy South Korea.

The attempts of the United States Government to revive a political corpse like Chiang Kai-shek and his putrid regime, which was rejected by the Chinese people, merely poison the international atmosphere in the Far East.

Distinguished delegates,

It is now more than ten years that the United Nations has been considering the question of People's China taking its legitimate seat in the United Nations. Each time this rostrum is taken by representatives of states who express the attitude of their governments toward this important question. Each time the states are, in the main, divided into two groups when discussing this item. One group follows the logic of the actual state of affairs, protects the legitimate rights of the great Chinese people, and declares plainly and openly, without hesitation, that it is time to eliminate a great historical injustice and to invite the Government of the People's Republic of China to send its delegation, which would

be here together with all of us in the United Nations and would take part in all its activities.

Under various pretexts the representatives of other states have been dodging a just decision and, in this way or another, have been trailing in the wake of the United States Government in thwarting the acceptance by the United Nations of the decision to restore the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

The arguments which the United States Government adduces against People's China can sound convincing only for those who follow in the footsteps of the American politicians who more than ten years ago sustained a fiasco in China as a result of the fall of the mercenary Kuomintang regime and the victory of the Chinese People's Revolution.

It is well known that for sixteen years the American ruling circles did not recognize the Soviet Union for the sole reason that our people had destroyed the bourgeois-landlord system and had carried through the Great Socialist Revolution. Naturally, our people did not ask the permission of any American politicians. The Chinese people, led by their Communist Party, acted likewise.

We do not doubt that the time will come when the political leaders of the United States will show a more sober approach to People's China and will, instead of the hostility which is today manifest at every step, regard that great country with dignity and respect.

Until the People's Republic of China takes its legitimate seat in the United Nations no conditions can be created for genuine negotiations and for the solution of the disarmament question. Indeed, if any agreement is reached on disarmament, will such an agreement be valid without China? After all, even if a disarmament agreement is negotiated, the United States will declare that it cannot be implemented because of China's non-participation, while it is the United States itself that is blocking in every possible way the participation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

We insistently urge you, distinguished delegates, to break this vicious circle. There cannot indeed be any disarmament without China, there cannot be any normal functioning of the United Nations without China.

Sensing the absurdity of the version that China is "represented" in the United Nations by the Chiang Kai-shekists and fearing for the fate of the Kuomintang stooges, the United States and certain other Western countries are attempting to railroad through the notorious idea of "two Chinas." But it is after all no secret to anybody that the idea of "two Chinas" is, in effect, a poorly camouflaged strategem aimed at dismembering the territory of Great China and tearing away the province of Taiwan, which is one of its parts.

It has long been clear that the provocative plans for creating "two Chinas" are doomed to failure, and the sooner certain political leaders in the United States understand this, the better it will be for the cause of world peace.

Those who think that it is the People's Republic of China that is most in need of the restoration of China's rights in the United Nations are mistaken. These gentlemen are making a mistake. If the purpose of our organization as a universal organization uniting all nations is interpreted correctly, it is difficult to say who is in greater need of the restoration of China's rights in the United Nations, whether it is China itself or the United Nations, which is called upon to be the broadest and most representative international organization. This organization is in need of such a great nation, such a great country as the People's Republic of China being represented in the United Nations and taking an active part in its work.

That is why the Soviet delegation proposes that the question of the restoration of China's legitimate rights in the United Nations be considered and resolved as an important and pressing question at the very outset of the work of the General Assembly session.

Allow me, Messrs. Delegates, to reply to the speech of the United States representative, who argued the necessity of continuing the present bankrupt policy with regard to the People's Republic of China and suggested that the Soviet proposal to restore China's legitimate rights in the United Nations be rejected.

The United States representative referred here to the speech of Comrade P'eng Chen, the Peking Mayor. I know Comrade P'eng Chen well; and had you seen him, you would realize that

he is absolutely not the kind of person he was presented to be here. He is a good man who enjoys respect in his country. The representative of the United States referred to the fact that Comrade P'eng Chen called the United States an imperialist power. But is this a discovery, gentlemen? Indeed, the whole world knows that the most imperialist power supporting the colonial regimes is the United States of America. All the sparrows are chirping this from the rooftops. And the United States representative, you see, is incensed by this statement of Comrade P'eng Chen's. What innocence! Just like a woman who tries to pass for a young girl even though she may have a dozen children. The United States representative also stated that Comrade P'eng Chen had said that Mr. Hammarskjold had followed in the Congo a policy in the interests of American imperialism, in the interests of the colonialists. Is this any news either? Mr. Hammarskjold himself knows better than P'eng Chen, whose policy he followed in the Congo, that he is a loyal servant of monopoly capital and represents in the United Nations the interests of states which are pursuing a piratical, imperialist, colonial policy.

The United States representative said that the People's Republic of China is attempting to seize islands in the Pacific. But what islands. I ask you, Mr. Representative of United States imperialism? The People's Republic of China wants to liberate Taiwan and other islands. To whom do these islands belong?

Look at the international agreements on this score which also bear the signature of the American state's representative and you will see that they say that Taiwan and the other islands located close to the Chinese coast belong to the Chinese people. The liberation of these islands is the legitimate right of the People's Republic of China, and we have supported these legitimate rights of the Chinese people and will continue to support them. Moreover, I should say that the Government of the People's Republic of China is displaying great constraint with regard to the liberation of these islands. But this is their internal affair and no one has any right to interfere. But had the Soviet Union found itself in a similar position, you may be sure that we would not have tolerated the occupation of our territory and would have long ago thrown all the traitors to the devil, so as to banish their very scent, so that these islands may belong to the people.

The United States delegate enlarged here on the regime in People's China. He indulged in many distortions and fabrications concerning repressions of some sort allegedly taking place there. All this is malicious slander of People's China. This is not a new trick. How much was the Soviet Union slandered, how many times was its doom forecast! But the Soviet Union lives and prospers. There is no system more democratic than that of the socialist states.

Is it for you, gentlemen from the United States, to say what democracy is? Sooner or later you will have to take a lesson in organizing a system under which the rights of every man are truly respected. Genuine democracy is possible only under socialism, under communism. Before speaking about regimes in socialist countries, I should recommend that the American representative look in a mirror and see what kind of regime exists in the United States.

The United States representative appealed here to the African countries and claimed that the United States loved these countries and was taking care of them. But, my dear gentlemen, in your democratic country can the representatives of these states—if they do not have United Nations credentials—stay at a hotel, get a lunch or dinner in a restaurant for whites? No, they cannot. This is humiliating, insulting to the dignity of every man. In America there is a sharp line between whites and Negroes. Is that democracy, is that respect for man? No, this is man-hating, sowing of enmity between whites and blacks.

Let Negroes and representatives of other peoples of Asia and Africa come to our country, to the Soviet Union, to the People's Republic of China, to any socialist country; they will find there a truly humane attitude, love and friendship. They will find this not because they are black but because our peoples deeply sympathize with those who are fighting for freedom, who for centuries have suffered, have been humiliated and oppressed by the colonialists.

In America Negroes are lynched and hanged only because they are black. All the world knows this. This is the subject of books, of press reports. Turn to your history, representative of the United States! We bow our heads to Abraham Lincoln, the great American who raised the banner of the struggle for the liberation of the Negroes. He was an American and he fought against other Ameri-

cans for the equality of peoples, for justice. But racial discrimination exists in the United States even today.

To this day in a number of localities in the United States Negro children cannot attend schools together with whites. Is this not a shame for a civilized society? And the United States representative deigns to smear the truly democratic regime of the People's Republic of China, which is building socialism. In our country we have a saying in such cases which runs somewhat like this: "He who lives in a glass house should not throw stones."

The United States representative smeared the regime of the People's Republic of China. To this I would say: the ruling circles of the United States are very friendly with regimes which are far from being democratic.

You regard Franco as your best friend—the butcher of the Spanish people, who has suppressed all democratic freedom in Spain, established a regime of bloody dictatorship, and is chopping off the heads of Spain's finest sons. But the Spanish people will rise to the struggle, will mete out just retribution to the butchers, and truth will triumph on Spanish soil!

(The President of the General Assembly interrupted Khrushchev and asked him to cooperate and refrain from personal attacks on the head of a member state of the United Nations. He said that these words by the speaker would be omitted from the official record of the session.)

I consider the President's remark improper. Why didn't you stop the representative of the United States when he slandered great China? In the United Nations there must be equal conditions for all states, and if you permit insults against socialist countries we shall not tolerate it. I reject such remarks. We did not come here as suppliants, we came as representatives of a great nation, of a great socialist state, and we are defending our friend—the People's Republic of China, its regime, its laws!

Now concerning the Franco regime. The United States maintains friendly treaty relations with this regime, has military bases on Spanish soil for conducting its aggressive imperialist policy.

Another best friend of the Government of the United States, whom it has proclaimed "a man of genius," is Syngman Rhee—the hangman of the Korean people. He brought matters to such a pass that he was booted out of South Korea and secretly made a

getaway from Korea in an American plane. And where is he hiding now? You may rest assured that he is of course kept by the United States of America.

In South Vietnam, too, they are chopping off people's heads, and actually it is the domain of the United States.

I should like to cite another argument in reply to the statement of the United States representative. He reproached Comrade P'eng Chen for having called America an imperialist state and for having called Mr. Hammarskjold, who is the Secretary-General of the United Nations (although I think this injustice will be rectified), a conductor of the policy of the colonialists. But if the representative of the United States considers that it is logical to demand, on this ground, that the People's Republic of China not be admitted to the United Nations, may it be asked: why then, do the representatives of the United States tolerate the presence of representatives of the Soviet Union, who now, as before, oppose the imperialist policy of the United States and the disgraceful role played by Mr. Hammarskjold in the Congo?

One more argument. It is your business, Messrs. Delegates, how you decide the question of restoring the legitimate rights of People's China in the United Nations. Sometimes when certain persons make unjust decisions, they consider these decisions to be right. But time, history, show such decisions to be false. What is the object of the people who deny China her rights in the United Nations? Do they want the United Nations to consist only of states with one social system? They do not like the People's Republic of China, they do not like the socialist system. But what would happen if the socialist countries withdrew from the United Nations and created an international organization of their own, if they appealed to other countries urging support for their efforts in the struggle for peace? That would be the death of the United Nations. That would mean no United Nations but two alignments which would be continuously ranged against each other. That would lead not to the lessening but rather to the aggravation of international tension, to an arms race. We do not want this. What we do want is that the United Nations really unite all states, regardless of their social and political systems, that it really unite all nations. Our common duty is to ensure life on earth without war between states, without armed conflict; and this can be at-

tained only if all states are united in a single organization—the organization of the United Nations. That is why we support the United Nations.

He who wants peace on earth, he who wants disarmament must vote for the People's Republic of China to take her legitimate place in the United Nations, for her to take part in the activities of this organization aimed at strengthening peace.

What the United States representative is suggesting here is a reflection of the old imperialist policy of inciting states against each other. That is why it does not want China to take her place in the United Nations. And they need this in order to follow the policy of the cold war, of the arms race, to thwart the possibility of agreement on disarmament. This is being done in pursuance of the policy of Dulles, the "brink of war" policy. But we know that any brink is a most precarious place, and even the best acrobat who undergoes special training may topple over at any time. It sometimes happens that he does topple and this is the end of him. This is a misfortune for the person. But if the policy of brinkmanship "topples" from this brink, that will be a catastrophe for all the countries of the world, because this will be a terrible, a nuclear missile war.

Those who fail to grasp this should stop to think about it.

In order to prevent a further aggravation of international tension it is essential to restore the rights of People's China in the United Nations. It is necessary to throw the Chiang Kai-shekist corpse to the devil and give the place in the United Nations to a real living body—the People's Republic of China.

October 3, 1960

A Reply on the Question of the Structure of UN Governing Bodies

Speech at the UN General Assembly

MR. PRESIDENT, FELLOW DELEGATES:

By way of reply to the speeches of certain delegates I should like to explain once more the position of the Soviet delegation on an important matter placed before the present General Assem-

bly of the United Nations for consideration. What I have in mind is the role and place of the executive organ of the United Nations which we are suggesting instead of the office of Secretary-General.

I am doing so in order to give a rebuff to those who distort our position as well as to explain it to those to whom the meaning of this proposal is not as yet clear, but who want to study and understand it correctly.

You will recall that the United Nations was created in 1945. In the circumstances attending the victorious termination of World War II, the best minds of that time thought about ways for establishing normal relations among states, for creating an international body which could solve outstanding problems arising between states or groups of states so as to prevent matters from becoming aggravated and especially to preclude war. This was the main task before the United Nations.

A charter of this organization was drafted which provided that there exist a General Assembly comprising all states which have accepted the United Nations Charter and meet the demands of the Charter.

For the solution of important questions, especially when they cause tension, there was established a Security Council so that it would be possible to reduce this tension without allowing matters to become aggravated, much less result in war.

The Soviet Union, China, the United States of America, Great Britain and France, the great countries of that time, were approved as permanent members of the Security Council. It was laid down by the Charter of the United Nations that decisions taken by the Security Council require the unanimity of these five states. This was not accidental. It reflected the wisdom of the sponsors and creators of the United Nations who took into account the real international conditions of that time.

Fifteen years have now passed since the United Nations was founded. Have any changes taken place in the world since that time? Yes indeed, tremendous changes have occurred. He who fails to realize this is in a heavy sleep and remains in the same state he was in fifteen years ago with all his old views and understanding of world problems. But we are dealing, or rather should be dealing, not with persons in a state of heavy sleep but with persons who have lived all this time and worked together with their peo-

ples and states, who see that great social and political changes have occurred in the world. When World War II ended, there were only two socialist states in all the world—the Soviet Union and the Mongolian People's Republic.

Unfortunately, this republic has not yet been admitted to the United Nations, and I would like to stress once more that such an attitude toward the Mongolian People's Republic is absolutely unjustifiable.

The leader of the capitalist world—the United States of America—emerged from the war the richest and economically most powerful state; the United States lost less than other countries during the war but earned from it more than any other state.

In the early postwar years the Soviet Union had a powerful army but a devastated national economy, and the three imperialist powers hoped that our state would soon breathe its last. They hoped that the existence of the socialist system on earth would thus end and socialism would survive only as an ideological and theoretical question.

But all these hopes of the imperialists, colonialists and monopoly capital proved to be illusory, and collapsed.

Not only did the Soviet Union restore its strength, but it also developed at a rate of advance which astonished all mankind. We train annually more than 100,000 engineers, we have created the world's first atomic power station, built the first atomic icebreaker, which is successfully breaking the ice in the Arctic Ocean. We have been the first to launch rockets into outer space. The successes of the Soviet Union have proved how great are the advantages of the socialist system, how boundless are the possibilities that socialism and communism offer for the development of the talents of the people.

The road of socialism has been adopted by great China, which is successfully developing her economy and culture. People's China offers one more objective illustration of how peoples liberated from imperialist oppression can quickly gain strength, consolidate their independence, overcome the economic and cultural backwardness of their countries.

Highly instructive is the example of Czechoslovakia. In the past it was a highly developed industrial capitalist country. Bourgeois ideologists contended that only backward, underdeveloped

countries provide the ground for socialism. Czechoslovakia refuted these fabrications and demonstrated that even a highly developed country which embarks on the road of socialism provides its people with unparalleled conditions for rapid progress, for a better life.

Or take the German Democratic Republic (GDR). Having adopted the path of peace, progress and socialism, the population of the German Democratic Republic put an end to the oppression of monopolies and militarism. Now the GDR is a peace-loving and rapidly developing country. It threatens no one. Quite different is the situation in West Germany. Its economy is developing on capitalist foundations, there is a revival of the same forces—revanchism, militarism, fascism—which had plunged the world into the Second World War. A hotbed of a new military war menace is developing there and it follows not a peaceful but a warlike policy.

These are only separate examples which show that socialism augurs peace, progress, prosperity, complete salvation from all the calamities and vices of capitalism for all mankind. Socialism has securely won its place on our planet, has earned the recognition and respect of the peoples.

The socialist states of Europe and Asia unite under their banners more than one billion people; they demonstrate to the whole world the advantages of the new and young socialist system over moribund capitalism.

I would like to draw the attention of the esteemed delegates to the Assembly to the question, apparently so simple: is it possible to ignore the fact that more than one billion of a global population of three billion live in countries most of which have formed and shaped their socialist statehood in the course of the past fifteen years?

It would seem that serious political leaders cannot ignore the new social structure of the world which is having a decisive influence on international relations today.

If this irrefutable fact is recognized, and only politically shortsighted people can refuse to recognize it, it will become crystal clear that the structure of certain organs of the United Nations which was quite normal at that time and was in line with the actual state of affairs is now outmoded. More than one-third

of the global population are to some extent discriminated against in the United Nations agencies, as, for instance, in the Security Council and particularly in the Secretariat. President Sukarno of Indonesia described this correctly in his speech here. Besides the large and powerful detachment of socialist countries, new young states, following a neutralist policy, have emerged on the international scene.

There is great India, which only recently was a British colony; there is Indonesia, a former Dutch colony; Burma and the United Arab Republic; there are young states of Africa and Asia. They have become independent countries and their population exceeds one billion. But the interests of these countries are not taken into consideration either in the Security Council or in the Secretariat of the United Nations.

We all live on one planet and therefore we must search for ways to normalize the relations among all states, to establish cooperation on an equal footing. The United Nations must be precisely the forum, the body where such cooperation is effected in the broadest and fairest way in the interests of preserving peace.

When the Soviet Government raises the question, for instance, of reorganizing the General Secretariat, this only shows our sincere concern for the necessity of ensuring the correct functioning of the United Nations; it shows that we take into consideration the interests of the peoples of all countries instead of the interests of some group of countries or even some circles.

Now one man is the interpreter and executant of all the decisions of the Assembly and the Security Council. But an old saying has it: there are no saints on earth and there have never been. Let those who believe that there are saints keep their belief. We have no faith in such fables.

And so this one man, Mr. Hammarskjold in this case, must interpret and execute the decisions of the Assembly and the Security Council with due consideration for the interests of the countries of monopoly capital, the interests of the socialist countries, and the interests of the neutralist countries. But this is impossible. Everyone has seen how vigorously the imperialist countries have been defending the position of Mr. Hammarskjold. Is it not clear whose interests he interprets and executes, to whom this "saint" belongs?

Mr. Hammarskjold has never been objective toward socialist countries; he has always defended the interests of the United States of America and other countries of monopoly capital. The developments in the Congo, where he played a most unseemly role, were but the last straw that has exhausted our patience. Indeed, had the composition of the Secretariat and the Security Council been different, no particularly tense developments would have taken place in the Congo. The colonialists would not have dared to seize power again; and had they done so, the United Nations forces not only would have expelled them but would have created conditions for the normal functioning of the Parliament and government lawfully elected by the Congolese people.

When the colonialists granted independence to the Congo, they expected it to be only fictitious. But the Congolese Government decided to defend its political and economic rights in all seriousness. It enraged the colonialists, they embarked on a military gamble and decided to impose on the Congolese people the old colonial order under the guise of fictitious independence.

I repeat, unfortunately in the United Nations the Congolese people did not find a protector of their interests. Is this the way to fulfill the tasks and purposes of the United Nations?

Mr. Hammarskjold used the United Nations Armed Forces not to support the lawful Parliament and government of the Congo, at whose request these troops were sent there, but to support the forces of the colonialists who were and are fighting against the Congolese Parliament and the lawful government in order to resubjugate the Congo. He used the United Nations Forces to interfere in the internal affairs of the young state. No one can tolerate any longer a situation in which the United Nations is used not to help the Congolese people, but to act against them, in which the United Nations acts in the interests of the colonialists. This was justly noted here by the leaders of the delegations of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Roumania, Bulgaria, Ghana, the United Arab Republic, Cuba, Indonesia and others.

To avoid any misunderstanding, I want to repeat: we do not and cannot trust Mr. Hammarskjold. Unless he himself shows enough courage and resigns, which would be a chivalrous act, so to speak, we shall draw the necessary conclusions from the situation now obtaining. A man who has trampled upon elementary

justice is not fit to occupy such an important post as that of the Secretary-General.

Some people may say that probably Mr. Hammarskjold should be replaced by another, more worthy person. They reason in the following way: suppose Mr. Hammarskjold made a gross mistake; is it not possible to rectify it by replacing him by another man? This, of course, could be done. But would we thus safeguard the United Nations against the repetition of similar mistakes in the future? I do not think so. Any other Secretary-General cannot be an objective representative of the three different groups of states.

Now, unfortunately, there is a certain bias in the work of the United Nations, in the work of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Secretary-General. So far only one group of countries, led by the United States, dominates here; and it dominates now not even by the right of the strong. At present these states have lost the so-called right of the strong because nothing but a fetish remains of the former strength which helped the colonialists to keep the colonial peoples in subjugation.

The actual state of affairs in the world today is such that the strength of the two most powerful states—the Soviet Union and the United States—is at least equal; and if we take into consideration other socialist countries and also former colonial countries, it will become clear that the peace-loving states have not only the law and justice but also strength on their side.

And if this is not taken into consideration, the United Nations will, of course, not be able to function. Strictly speaking, it will then fully lose its significance because it will be unable to fulfill its main task—to maintain peace among nations.

But then why should we speak of the future? We see now the result of the one-sided approach to the solution of the questions confronting the United Nations due to the predominance of the imperialist states in this organization. The post of the Secretary-General is occupied by a representative of the Western Powers; no representative of the socialist countries has even once been allowed to take the post of the President of the General Assembly in fifteen years. This is a situation that calls for no special explanation!

The pressure of the imperialist countries at the General Assembly becomes particularly evident in settling the question of

the restoration of China's legitimate rights in the United Nations. I have already spoken about this and I am repeating this again for those who are thwarting the solution of the question on the participation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, for those who this time again follow in the wake of the imperialist powers. It must be clear to everyone that this injustice must be rectified at long last. No disarmament is possible without China; without China there can be no normal work of the United Nations.

But it is important that the United Nations be able to quench the heat of war in time, wherever it may appear. How can it be done? It can be done only by taking into consideration the interests of all three groups of states, by taking into consideration the interests of the colonial peoples as well. Now the colonialists are doing their utmost to perpetuate the regime of slavery in colonial countries, and in the countries whose peoples are winning their independence the colonialists are trying to hoodwink them by granting fictitious independence while actually trying to perpetuate the colonialist regime.

Thus, in view of the present conditions, is it possible to choose one man for the post of the United Nations Secretary-General who would be able to reckon with the interests of all three groups of states? We think that this is impossible. Of course, from the viewpoint of devotion to the ideas of peace, the ideas of humaneness, one might appoint to the post of Secretary-General a representative of the socialist states, and such a man would truly reflect the most progressive ideas of human society, the ideas of ensuring peace. But it is a foregone conclusion that the Western Powers would distrust such a person and this distrust is quite understandable.

But if we ourselves admit that the appointment of a representative of the socialist countries to the post of United Nations Secretary-General would not create normal conditions for the work of this body, how can the Western Powers demand that we believe in the objectivity of their candidate, in this case Mr. Hammarskjold? The neutralist countries also want to play their part in the United Nations; they want their interests to be safeguarded, and these legitimate demands of the neutralist countries must be taken into consideration.

Therefore the only correct solution would be to set up an executive in which the three groups of states would be represented by three persons so that they could execute the decisions of the Security Council and General Assembly.

Some people say that if the United Nations executive consists of three members, it will be paralyzed. But the task of the people appointed to the executive will be precisely to find such wise solutions as would secure peace, and this means that they must take into account the interests of all groups of states. If the decisions are made in the interests of only one group—for instance, if the decisions are made, as is the case now, in the interests of the imperialist states only—they will be unrealistic decisions. Let us take a sober view of the matter. The imperialist states have no practical basis for breathing life into such unilateral decisions because they are unable to impose their decisions by force.

Those who allege that the Soviet Union advances proposals which break up the United Nations assess the work of the United Nations only from the viewpoint of one group of states. When we say that the interests of the first, second and third group of states are to be taken into account, they claim that this “destroys the United Nations.” No, this is a just demand. And tomorrow, if not today, the peoples of the world will understand that the United Nations must take into consideration the interests of all states. The other way is the domination of one group of states, and this would not mean solution of problems but aggravation of international tension, which may even lead to armed conflict.

Messrs. Delegates, sacred is the striving of all peoples to ensure peace on earth, and disarmament is the best guarantee of peace. It is precisely disarmament that all peace-loving people long for. It cannot be replaced by control over armaments without disarmament. If our disarmament proposals are accepted, we are prepared to accept any Western proposals on international control.

And what is the meaning of the control over armaments which United States President Eisenhower offers us and of which Prime Minister Macmillan of Great Britain has also spoken here? Control over armaments means admission of the necessity to have armaments in the future as well. But it is clear to everyone that if armaments exist, then at a critical moment all those who have

arms in their possession will, willingly or unwillingly, reach for the holster, reach for these arms.

At a critical moment those who have arms in their possession and follow the “from position of strength” policy will not ask the opinion of the Security Council or convene the General Assembly to discuss the question of whether or not they should use their weapons; they are sure to use them.

And if this happens, then, apparently, no Assembly would meet, because war with all its destructive consequences would follow.

Therefore, the best way to safeguard peace is to do away with the means of destroying people, that is, to do away with armaments. This is the Soviet people’s sincere desire. We stated long ago, through the mouth of the founder of the Soviet state Lenin, that we are for disarmament. At this Assembly the Soviet Government has once again set forth its viewpoint and submitted its specific proposals for your consideration.

Therefore, I insistently urge you to realize the exceptional importance of the disarmament problem for all peoples of the world, for our contemporaries and for the generations to come. The efforts of all countries and all peoples are needed to compel the governments of the countries on whom agreement depends to carry out general and complete disarmament in practice. Some people say that Khrushchev and Eisenhower should be locked up in some special chamber and kept there until they agree on disarmament. This, of course, is naive. We can sit there as long as you like, but if the President, and especially the circles backing him have no desire to agree, then no smoke will rise from the chimney, as happens according to tradition when the Pope is elected.

It is all the more true since in this case we are not dealing with the question of electing the Pope but with the much more complicated question of disarmament and the prevention of the threat of war, a question of life and death for millions upon millions of people.

It is said that after a disarmament agreement is reached, international armed forces must be formed. In principle we agree with this. But the question arises: who is going to command them? The United Nations Secretary-General? But in such a case the

decisions on these or other actions will depend on the ethical convictions, on the conscience of the United Nations Secretary-General. Is it permissible to make the destiny of millions contingent on the actions of one man occupying this post? We cannot rely on the conscience of the Secretary-General because everyone has his own view on conscience, his own understanding of ethics.

The capitalist world has its own ethics, the communist world its own, and the neutralist countries their own.

Therefore, with due consideration for the practical conditions, we must ensure a structure of the United Nations apparatus which would reflect the actual state of affairs in the world and express the interests of the peoples of different groups of states. There can be no disarmament, no international armed forces can be set up unless all three groups are safeguarded against the abuses of these armed forces.

How can this be ensured? We want no privileges for ourselves, but we do not want others to have privileges over us. We want all to be on an equal footing.

Therefore, if you gentlemen really want disarmament, if you want the international organs to work in this direction for peaceful purposes, then the United Nations apparatus must be reconstructed so that the United Nations Secretariat and the Security Council may reflect in their work the interests of the three basic groups of states, in order that the interests of all the United Nations member states may be protected.

Some persons utter sharp words and bitter accusations here, alleging that Khrushchev is breaking up the United Nations. We reject these accusations and declare most definitely that the aim of the Soviet Union's proposals is to consolidate the United Nations.

We want the United Nations to be indeed an organ in which the interests of all groups among the United Nations member states are taken into consideration and protected equally. The ensuring of world peace must be the bedrock of the entire activity of the United Nations.

But the states which pursue their own narrow group interests, dominating the interests of other groups of states, are dealing a blow at the United Nations; and, in the final count, if they persist

in carrying on their line, they will lead the United Nations to its destruction.

If the machinery designed to settle the most important international issues with due consideration for the interests of all states, if this machinery of the United Nations—the Security Council and the Secretariat—settle these questions to the detriment of the socialist or neutralist states, then naturally, these countries will not recognize such decisions and will rely on their own strength in defending the interests of their states, the interests of peace.

This is the choice now facing the UN. Either we truly unite our efforts and do everything to consolidate the United Nations and thus ensure cooperation of all states toward peace, or the forces reflecting the interests and privileges of a group of imperialist states will continue to dominate the United Nations and its machinery, which will greatly damage the cause of peace and international cooperation.

Those who support the policy of force and are trying to impose their will on others through the United Nations should clearly realize what place they occupy and what responsibility for the future they assume before the world.

I would like in all frankness to say to the delegates of the current session: do not fall for the high-sounding phrases pronounced here by Mr. Hammarskjöld and the representatives of colonial powers who are trying to justify the bloody deeds committed against the people of the Congo by colonialists and their hangers-on.

I would like to say that the United States representative who spoke here is defending the old, the rotten, that which is already collapsing. But neither the representative who spoke here for the United States nor others will succeed in propping it up: a dead man cannot be made to breathe. Colonialism has lived out its time. Our duty is to bury this stinking corpse as soon as possible and thus cleanse the atmosphere and create a better life for all the people in the world.

Our sympathy, I repeat, is with those who are fighting for their freedom and independence!

Some people say that Khrushchev is calling for rebellion. I am not calling for rebellion, because the question of rebellion against unwanted order in any country is settled by the people

themselves. I only said that if the colonialists do not agree to grant independence and freedom to the colonial peoples, then the peoples of the colonial countries can do nothing else but rise against the shameful oppression, and all people of integrity must offer a helping hand to those who are fighting for their dignity, against robbery, against the colonialists.

We extend a hand to all who still suffer in the chains of colonial slavery. If you regard this as a call to rebellion, I am proud of this and say that the freedom-loving peoples of the Soviet Union extend a hand of assistance to the peoples rising against the colonialists, for their freedom and independence!

Esteemed Delegates,

The question uppermost in the mind of all mankind now is whether the problem of disarmament will be solved, whether we shall achieve a solution of this vital question.

We, on our part, firmly declare that we have come here with the most honest intentions and are willing to do our utmost to make peace prevail on earth, and not only peace but also friendship among the peoples.

The Soviet Government will continue to work honestly toward this goal, as the sower works so that people may have a good harvest. He selects the best grains and throws them into the soil. When he throws the seeds into the soil, he is not sure that a good and favorable spring and summer lie ahead. No, he knows that the sprouts of these seeds may encounter droughts, storms and hurricanes. And it also happens that some grains just fall into rocky soil.

But the man who sows cannot help working. He cannot fold his hands if the forces of nature operate against his efforts. He does not argue: is it worthwhile to work, to sow? Man lives and wants to live! And that is why he is tirelessly working to ensure life for the living, a better life for the peoples.

At the bidding of our people, we have come here and are persistently sowing the seeds of peace. Perhaps not all our seeds will fall into fertile soil. On the contrary, I am even convinced that some of the seeds fall into rocky soil. But gentlemen, you have certainly seen how a powerful pine tree grows on what seems to be the most barren rocks. It is difficult to say what it thrives on. But it grows!

We believe that if some of our seeds of peace fall into rocky soil, not all of them perish, because they are sound seeds, the seeds of human truth, and they are sown in the name of truth and human life. We are convinced that these seeds will grow, will push through the rocks to reach a nutritive medium and will develop into a strong and powerful tree of life. We believe in life and fight for it, for the triumph of peace on earth.

We are convinced that the seeds of truth will reach the minds of the peoples to whom we are appealing; we are convinced that the people sowing sound seeds, the seeds of truth, the seeds of life will be rewarded for their labor by the reaffirmation of truth and by the victory of the forces of reason and peace over the forces of war. To achieve this one must tirelessly sow the seeds of truth, urge the people to fight for this truth, to fight against evil dry winds and storms. And if all fight, precisely all and not just a group of states, this truth will prevail and peace on earth will be safeguarded.

Thank you for your attention.

October 3, 1960

Reply to Letter and Draft Resolution Received From the Heads of Government of Ghana, India, Indonesia, United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia

On September 29th, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR received the following letter from President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India, President Sukarno of Indonesia, President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic, and President Josip Broz Tito of Yugoslavia.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

We have the honor of informing you that in view of the existing tension in international relations and being confident that you, Your Excellency, the Government and people of your great power are striving ardently for the lessening of this tension and for establishing conditions for the consolidation of peace, we intend to submit for the immediate consideration of the current General Assembly session a draft resolution the text of which is enclosed herein.

We hope that this effort of ours will meet with your sympathetic and favorable attitude.

We avail ourselves of the opportunity to assure again, Your Excellency, of our high esteem for you.

The Draft Resolution submitted by the five governments to the Fifteenth Session of the United Nations General Assembly read as follows:

The General Assembly,

Deeply concerned with the recent deterioration in international relations which threatens the world with grave consequences,

Aware of the great expectancy of the world that this Assembly will assist in helping to prepare the way for the easing of world tension,

Conscious of the grave and urgent responsibility that rests on the United Nations to initiate helpful efforts,

Requests, as a first urgent step, the President of the United States of America and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to renew their contacts interrupted recently so that their declared willingness to find solutions of the outstanding problems by negotiation may be progressively implemented.

Chairman Khrushchev's reply to the President of Ghana read as follows:

TO HIS EXCELLENCY, MR. KWAME NKRUMAH,
THE PRESIDENT OF GHANA:

The Soviet Government and I personally as the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR have a high opinion of the motives by which you, as well as the President of Indonesia, the President of the United Arab Republic, the President of Yugoslavia and the Prime Minister of India were guided in sending this letter and a draft resolution of the General Assembly to the President of the United States and myself, with expressions of a desire for the resumption of contacts between the President and myself, so that it would become possible to discuss questions which at present cloud the international situation, and to find solutions for these questions through negotiations. This message shows once again that the state of international relations is far from normal today and that the international situation, particularly the relations

between the Soviet Union and the United States, evokes a legitimate feeling of anxiety among many states and leading statesmen.

The Soviet Government has always been and still is of the opinion that unsolved international problems, including the problems of relations between the USSR and the USA, must and can be settled peacefully through negotiations if the sides concerned desire to do so. Guided by this the Soviet Government insisted on the necessity of the discussion of such problems at the highest level, considering that most radical decisions, adopted through an understanding between the leading statesmen, are necessary for the improvement of the international situation and the solution of disputed problems, particularly the disarmament problem which would put an end to the senseless destruction of tremendous material values and the wasting of the energy of nations for the production of the means of destruction. It is precisely for this reason that the Soviet Government insisted on calling a Summit conference and expressed the hope that this conference would lead to a radical change in the international situation and help to consolidate peace and eliminate the contradictions existing between states.

It is generally known what happened after an agreement on calling a Summit conference was reached. Just at the time when the peoples, including the people of the Soviet Union, were hopefully anticipating the fruitful results of this conference, the US Government right on the eve of the Summit embarked upon a path of treachery which assumed the nature of such aggressive acts as the violation of the state frontier of the USSR by the American U-2 military aircraft. It is common knowledge that the US Government through the President himself and the Secretary of State confirmed that these acts, as well as the subsequent violation of the Soviet state frontier by the American RB-47 plane, were manifestations of a certain "deliberate policy" of the United States. It has also been confirmed that the US Government and President Eisenhower personally have no intentions of relinquishing this policy and still continue it to the present day.

The US Government has not provided the least compensation to the Soviet Union which suffered damages as a result of a crude violation of its sovereignty by American aircraft. But on the contrary it has many times affirmed the above-mentioned treacherous

policy in spite of the fact that this policy constitutes an outrageous and unprecedented violation of the very foundations of international law and of the sacred principle of respect for the sovereignty of states. Thus, the American Government has placed itself in a position which apparently makes it difficult for it to embark upon the path of honest negotiations with the Soviet Union. Due to this policy the US President has also personally placed himself in a position where it is apparently hard for him to establish contacts with the head of the Soviet Government, contacts which could produce positive results.

It goes without saying that any attempt to advance some preliminary conditions in establishing such contacts by a party which has taken to perfidy is more evidence that the present US Government has no serious intentions of seeking a settlement of controversial questions splitting the states, through negotiations based on mutual respect for the interests of the parties in these negotiations. This also shows what little respect the US Government has for the aspirations of other states to contribute their share in easing tension in the relations between the big powers. It stands to reason that the position of two such powers as the USSR and the USA is of paramount importance for the further development of international relations. However, the active role of other states, big and small, and of the United Nations Organization as a whole in settling outstanding problems can by no means be underestimated.

Responsibility for the situation which has arisen lies with the US Government and only with the US Government. I am deeply convinced that every statesman capable of objectively evaluating this situation cannot but draw the conclusion as to who is putting obstacles in the way of a resumption of contacts between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States of America for the settlement of questions causing tension in the relations between countries, mentioned in your appeal and in the draft resolution.

The situation as we see it today is that the US Government, far from denouncing the above-mentioned actions, even in spite of the fact that President Eisenhower personally declared in Paris that he had given instructions to refrain in future from sending US planes inside the Soviet Union while he remained in the

White House, is pursuing the announced aggressive course of foreign policy. Only this can explain why in his speech at the General Assembly and in his reply letter to your appeal he maintains silence on the question of the sending of American U-2 warplanes inside the Soviet Union and raises the question about the American RB-47 plane flight which, as we all know, took place after the breakdown of the Summit meeting and after the President's statement on the discontinuation of such flights of US planes inside the Soviet Union.

It is obvious that if the US Government continues in future to follow the aforementioned policy, then under these conditions not a single self-respecting state, showing concern for the integrity of its sovereignty and its security, can have faith in statements by the US Government of its desire to improve relations between the USSR and the USA. This fully refers to the disarmament problem as well, if we take into account that the attitude of the USA toward disarmament questions is obviously aimed at breaking up any fruitful talk on disarmament and proceeds not from the necessity of disarmament under strict international control, but from the establishment of control over armament, i.e., the setting up of an approved system of international espionage under the UN flag.

The Soviet Government not only lives in the past but looks to the future as well. Whatever tense relations there may be between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, these relations can be improved if the government leaders rise above one or another of personal prejudices and feelings of hostility, and are guided by the great responsibility resting on their shoulders for the destinies of the world. It is the profound conviction of the Soviet Government that the present worsened state in relations between the USSR and the USA can be overcome. However, this requires a clear admission of what caused these relations to deteriorate. What is needed is a clear admission that it was caused by the unprecedented perfidious actions of the US Government which took the road of committing provocative, aggressive acts against the Soviet Union. In other words, we are ready to establish contact and start negotiations with the President and the Government of the United States of America, having in view that the US Government will find the courage to condemn the above-

mentioned actions, which caused Soviet-American relations to worsen, and will manifest goodwill in bettering these relations in deeds.

Such are the considerations of the Soviet Government, which it deemed necessary to express in reply to the letter addressed by the leaders of five countries to the President of the United States and to me.

Respectfully,

N. KHRUSHCHEV

Chairman of the Council of Ministers
of the USSR

New York, October 3, 1960.

* * *

Similar replies were forwarded to the Prime Minister of India, the President of Indonesia, the President of the United Arab Republic, and the President of Yugoslavia.

October 7, 1960

Meeting With Members of United Nations Journalists Association

On October 7, the United Nations Journalists Association gave a luncheon for the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, N. S. Khrushchev.

The President of the Association, Mr. Paul Sanders, introduced Chairman Khrushchev.

PAUL SANDERS: Mr. Chairman, when we sent our invitation to the *Baltika*, we did not expect you to be so generous with press conferences. We erroneously thought that your acceptance of our invitation would give us certain advantages. Now we see that this might have been interpreted as a kind of monopoly to which you certainly could never agree.

I must say that your treatment of the press can be described in no other way but as most democratic.

Having had the opportunity of watching you for several weeks at General Assembly sessions and having heard many stories about you, I believe that there is much in common between you and the press. They say that you are an emotional man. But, Mr. Chairman, emotions are a source of news to us, and being human, we

are not devoid of emotion, no matter how hard we try to be impartial. You like publicity as much as we do, and this is why we like you.

But more than anything else we know you as a great propagandist of the ideas of peaceful coexistence. We are glad to greet you among us—among those who made coexistence a practical reality. We represent different countries and have different biographies, we belong to different political creeds. We write for papers and magazines or work for radio stations representing the broadest variety of views. But a supreme spirit of comradeship reigns among us. We do not argue on those questions which are likely to divide us, and if there are not too many extraordinary and evening meetings, we often discuss various questions among ourselves in an effort to better understand what is the cause of these difficulties. You will thus see that coexistence is not a problem to us, even if it is a very difficult problem for the world.

But we simply do not know whether you and the others will make a success of the idea of peaceful coexistence on a world scale or how you will do that. We hope that you will explain this to us along with other questions.

In conclusion I should like to say in Russian, so far as my pronunciation permits, *Dobro pozhalovat* (Welcome here).

Gentlemen, I give you Chairman Nikita Khrushchev.

KHRUSHCHEV: Mr. President of the Association, dear gentlemen, comrades, friends,

I am glad to meet you journalists who cover the work of the United Nations. I often meet journalists. Yours is a difficult but a noble profession. The press can help the peoples to understand correctly everything going on in the complex modern world. But the press can also help to disorient the peoples if it is used for the selfish ends of specific circles.

You are very busy nowadays. The Fifteenth Session of the United Nations General Assembly is the most significant session since the United Nations was founded. At this session we shall have to consider such major international problems as disarmament and the complete abolition of the disgraceful colonial system. We attach exceptional importance to a successful, agreed solution of these problems. All the peoples are interested in dis-

armament because this is the only way to avoid new, devastating war.

I need not tell you that all these and other questions can be solved, provided there is good will and desire for cooperation among all countries, on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence, abstention from aggressive acts and observance of the standards of international law.

In present-day conditions it is ridiculous to try to impose any decisions upon other countries by using a mechanical majority in the United Nations. It is essential that the United Nations take into account the interests of all existing groups of states, both those who belong to Western military alliances and the socialist and neutralist states. The creation of an appropriate structure for the working bodies of the United Nations could help to improve the activities of the United Nations.

I urge all of you to use the force of the pen, your abilities, your influence to create a climate helpful to the activities of the United Nations; I urge you to write truthfully. May a truthful and realistic picture of the world today and of the problems confronting all of us arise before millions of your readers.

Thank you for your attention. Now I am ready to reply to your questions.

* * *

PAULINE FREDERICK (National Broadcasting Company): Mr. Chairman, do you consider that there is any hope for progress in disarmament even before a relaxation of differences is achieved and before the removal of the fear and mistrust existing between the United States and the Soviet Union?

KHRUSHCHEV: To abandon hope for agreement on disarmament would, I think, be tantamount to dooming the world to another war, would be tantamount to an admission of impotence by those people who must think about peace and create the conditions of peaceful coexistence. That is why I am now optimistic about the possibility of reaching agreement on disarmament, and I have declared more than once that such conditions exist.

It is difficult to judge how far these conditions have now matured because the current session of the United Nations General Assembly coincides with a "stormy period" in the life of the

American people. I am referring to the presidential elections. Everyone in the United States is now engaged in this, everything is subordinated to this; and the leaders on whom a solution of the disarmament problem depends consider only which presidential candidate will be elected. This is unfortunate because one leader or another might become president; this is of no decisive importance for international problems for this is the domestic problem of a single country. Well, now everything in the United States is subordinated to the elections, and we must reckon with this. But this is a transient feature.

We believe that everything must be done to safeguard peace, that one must not give up hope but continue a stubborn struggle for peaceful coexistence, for disarmament, for safeguarding an enduring peace throughout the world. But the main thing in the struggle for an enduring peace is disarmament, and not control over armaments as Mr. Eisenhower, the President of the United States, suggests. I repeat, though I have spoken of this many times, I shall go on repeating until everyone understands that disarmament, the destruction of weapons is the only way of avoiding war, while control over armaments means the preservation of arms. And if arms are preserved, even under control, those who own the arms can always use them for aggressive purposes whenever they want to. Therefore everyone who really wants peace must strive not for control over armaments but for disarmament, the destruction of weapons under the strictest, most extensive and penetrating international control.

In this context I should like to clarify another question. I should like to correct the report published in American newspapers on my meeting with Mr. Macmillan. The newspapers reported not quite accurately on the results of my meetings and conversations with Mr. Macmillan, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.

We really discussed disarmament, the possibility of reaching agreement on this question. Mr. Macmillan said that one must not be hasty about this question, must wait and see until better conditions are created for confidence between countries. Only then could agreement on disarmament be reached. Mr. Macmillan believes that about five to ten years might be required to create a climate of confidence and that for the time being it would be

better to set up some technical committees of experts to study these questions. To put it in a nutshell, he suggests moving as slowly as many insects, snails and other slow-moving organisms do on earth.

If the question of disarmament is made to depend upon relaxation of tension and establishment of confidence, as some would have it, I shall tell you that this is a most dangerous approach. This is tantamount to arguing about which came first, the chicken or the egg. Which came first, the chicken or the egg—I believe this question has not been solved to this day. Therefore on the question of disarmament, too, to talk about what to begin with—the establishment of conditions for confidence or disarmament—is futile. My position is that we must begin with the main thing, that is, disarmament: we must destroy armaments, establish control to see that no one arms himself. This will create the best conditions for sincere and fraternal relations among all peoples.

Now I should like to say something about the time needed to achieve confidence. If we take a period of five or ten years—such a period has been mentioned—this contradicts the statements of the Western circles themselves, since they say that it is essential to accelerate agreement on disarmament. Is it not a fact that the longer the agreement is delayed, the greater will become, with every passing year, the number of countries possessing atomic weapons and rockets? And if there are more states armed with atomic hydrogen bombs and rockets, the difficulties of reaching agreement on disarmament will become even greater. It would seem that, following from this Western logic, we must speed up disarmament, but Mr. Macmillan says that we must wait five or ten years. This means that now we must doom these negotiations to futility. So the idea seems to me that I, a grandfather, will start these talks and my grandchildren will finish them! This is a chain reaction for which all mankind will have to pay.

I must say that I have many grandchildren and I hope that my grandchildren will follow their grandfather, but I still want to do everything for the grandchildren so that they may live under peaceful conditions, may thank us for having upheld peace.

CHAIRMAN: The next two questions are similar and therefore I have decided to read them simultaneously.

JOSEPH NEWMAN (*New York Herald Tribune*): Would you accept the results of a two-thirds majority vote in the United Nations to settle the question as to whether or not Mr. Hammarskjold should remain in office as United Nations Secretary-General and to decide on your proposal for a three-man executive?

ARNE TORREN (*Expressen*): Mr. Chairman, you said in your speech in the Assembly on Monday that you would draw the necessary conclusions from the existing situation if the Secretary-General does not resign. Mr. Hammarskjold replied that he would not abandon his post. Could you tell us what conclusion you have already drawn or going to draw?

KHRUSHCHEV: These two are related questions but they are not identical.

Regarding Mr. Hammarskjold's statement that he will not step down from his post, you have heard what I said in my speech: if Mr. Hammarskjold possessed gentlemanly qualities, he would step down from his post. But I was not sure whether he had such qualities, and in this respect Mr. Hammarskjold fully justified my opinion of him.

Now regarding the decision of the question by a two-thirds majority.

Even if such a decision as you speak about were made by a two-thirds majority, even if it were made by a majority of 99 per cent, we would not agree with such a decision anyhow.

The principles of majority which you determine by two-thirds in solving disputable issues are quite acceptable within a country when domestic—political, economic and other—questions are decided. But in this case we are dealing with a complex international question. This question is decided by countries belonging to the United Nations. But this is not a parliament but an international forum which has been established in order to solve questions in such a way that its decisions would not harm any state belonging to this forum.

If you like, I shall present this question in a more naked form. Suppose the following "ideal" thought were to occur to representatives of member states of the United Nations: let us decide to liquidate the socialist system in the Soviet Union. What would

happen if all, except the representatives of the socialist countries, were to vote for this? What would we have replied to this? We would have said, as is our Russian custom in such cases: "Out with you! You have adopted such a decision and you may live with it; as for us, we have lived under our socialist system and will go on living under it. And if anyone interferes—you will excuse me for such an unrefined but most figurative expression—we shall give him a good punch in the jaw!"

Gentlemen, a very serious question has been raised here. That is why I should like to dwell on it further. I beg you to ponder this question thoroughly. A majority of votes in the United Nations, which consists of imperialist, socialist and neutralist states, is still held by countries of the imperialist, colonial bloc. We, the socialist countries, are today in a minority in the United Nations. But this situation might change. Today we are in a minority, but tomorrow, as we warn you, you will be in a minority. Hence, you must not abuse a temporary majority in the United Nations in order to impose decisions on the minority, because, I repeat, this is not a parliament. We are discussing here not the domestic problems of one country or another, we are discussing international problems with due respect for sovereignty and non-intervention in the affairs of other states. This must be borne in mind, this must be the point of departure. Then a correct solution of the problem will be reached.

Besides, I beg you to ponder seriously our proposal concerning the structure of the United Nations. We do not demand a situation which would give us an equal number of seats with the Western countries in the Security Council and the United Nations Secretariat. We do not ask for a majority, we only ask for our share.

The world has a population of three billion. The socialist countries represent more than one billion of the population. This means more than one-third. But we are not petty and we will not weigh everything on scales up to the precision of a gram. We accept one-third. The imperialist, colonial powers have less than one-third of the world population in their countries, but we tell them: "You take a third too." The neutralist countries account for more than one-third, and we tell them: "You take one-third too."

Thus, all three groups of states would be represented in the United Nations—and this is an international organization—the capitalist, the countries of monopoly capital, the colonial powers; the socialist countries, the countries of the really free world, the freest of the free; and the neutralist countries. And all would have their share, their one-third. This would create equal conditions for all three groups of states. This would make it possible to solve international problems without prejudicing any group of states. Is this not sensible?

We want no privileges but our share to which we are entitled.

If you want to subordinate us to yourselves by a majority and to compel us to settle issues under unequal conditions, you will compel us to uphold our interests not by voting in the United Nations but by acting outside the United Nations, i.e., by relying on our strength, on our might. And this, as you understand, already leads to an aggravation of relations.

Our proposals contain a reasonable starting point. We want a relaxation of international tension, we want peaceful coexistence, we want peace and friendship. You, on the other hand, struggle for domination over us, over the socialist countries and over the neutralist countries. Hence, you stand on the positions of continuing the "cold war" and aggravating relations. Ponder this, gentlemen! If you do not ponder this today, if you understand this wrongly, I hope you will understand this tomorrow, because there is no other way out.

That is how the question stands: either we shall develop our relations along the road of eliminating international tension and the cold war, strive for peace and friendship, or we shall continue the line of aggravation which might end God knows where, because every aggravation of tension and the cold war might turn into a hot war.

He who wants peace and friendship among the peoples must consider the interests not only of his country and his group of countries, he must also consider the interests of the socialist countries, the neutralist countries.

We do not want to impose our socialist system upon you. Go on living as your conscience dictates, but do not interfere with our living according to the dictates of our conscience. Let us not inter-

ERROR: stackunderflow
OFFENDING COMMAND: ~

STACK: